



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.


We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

BR
1
.B56



THE
AMERICAN
6015-1
BIBLICAL REPOSITORY;

DEVOTED TO
Biblical and General Literature, Theological Discussion, the History
of Theological Opinions, etc.

CONDUCTED BY
ABSALOM PETERS, D. D., AND SELAH B. TREAT.

SECOND SERIES.
VOL. VI.—NOS. XI, XII.—WHOLE NOS. XLIII, XLIV.

NEW-YORK:
PUBLISHED BY WM. R. PETERS, BRICK-CHURCH CHAPEL,
36 PARK ROW, FRONTING THE CITY HALL.

BOSTON:
WHIPPLE & DARBELL, NO. 9 CORNHILL.
LONDON:
WILEY & PUTNAM, 35 PATERNOSTER ROW.

1841.

42982

ENTERED according to Act of Congress, in the year 1841, by
WM. R. PETERS,
in the Clerk's Office of the District Court of the Southern District of
New-York.

CONTENTS OF VOL. VI.

NO. XI.

	Page		Page
ART. I. THE PRIMITIVE STATE OF MANKIND. By Philip Lindsley, D. D., Pres. of the University of Nashville, Tenn.	1	ART. VIII. REVIEW OF QUINCY'S HISTORY OF HARVARD UNIVERSITY. By one of the Professors of Yale College,	177
ART. II. BAPTISM;—THE INTERPRETATION OF ROM. 6: 3, 4, AND COL. 2: 12. By Rev. Edward Beecher, Pres. of Illinois College,	28	ART. IX. ANGLO-SAXON LITERATURE,	196
ART. III. THE STUDY OF THE CLASSICS AS AN INTELLECTUAL DISCIPLINE. By E. D. Sanborn, Prof. of the Latin Lang. and Lit., Dartmouth, N. H.	56	ART. X. REVIEW OF COLEMAN'S ANTIQUITIES OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH. By Ralph Emerson, D. D., Prof. of Eccl. Hist., Theol. Sem. Andover, Mass.	212
ART. IV. RELIGIOUS LITERATURE OF FRANCE AND SWITZERLAND: —GAUSSEN ON DIVINE INSPIRATION. By an American in Paris, Religious Literature of France and Switzerland,	76	ART. XI. CRITICAL NOTICES.	
Gausсен's Theopneustia,	87	1. Grant's Nestorians,	227
ART. V. THE ANTEDILUVIAN CHRONOLOGY OF THE BIBLE. Translated from the Latin of Michaelis, by Stephen Chase, Prof. of Math. in Dartmouth College, N. H.	114	2. Parker's Lectures on Universalism,	229
Note by the Editor,	114	3. Robinson's Bib. Researches,	230
ART. VI. THE COMMON SCHOOL SYSTEM OF NEW ENGLAND, WITH SOME ACCOUNT OF THE RECENT IMPROVEMENTS ADOPTED IN MASSACHUSETTS AND CONNECTICUT. By Rev. Emerson Davis, Westfield, Mass.	139	4. Anthon's Classical Dictionary,	233
ART. VII. THE RABBIES AND THEIR LITERATURE. By Isaac Nordheimer, D. P., Prof. Orient. Lang., University of the City of New-York,	154	5. History of Missions in the South Sea,	235
Historical Sketch of the Rabbinical Schools in Persia,	154	6. Christian Experience,	236
Historical Sketch of the Schools in Spain,	163	7. Hall's Refutation of Baptist Errors,	236
The Jewish Ritual,	173	8. Stephens' Travels in Central America,	237
		9. Hallam's Lit. of Europe,	241
		10. Phelps' Perpetuity of the Sabbath,	242
		11. Sutton on the Lord's Supper,	243
		12. Sutton's Disce Mori,	243
		13. Taylor's History of Society,	244
		14. Baldwin's Themes for the Pulpit,	245
		15. Schlegel's Philosophy of History,	245
		16. Rauch's Psychology,	246
		17. Livingston's Oxford Theology,	247
		18. Todd's Great Cities,	248
		19. Old Humphrey's Observations,	248
		20. Old Humphrey's Addresses,	248
		21. Lindley's Horticulture,	249
		22. Gallaudet and Hooker's Spelling-Book,	249
		23. Memorial of Jay's Jubilee	250
		ART. XII. RECENT LITERARY INTELLIGENCE,	250

Contents.

NO. XII.

	Page		Page
ART. I. THE PHILOSOPHY OF THE Gnostics:—THE MANICHEAN HERESY, AND INFLUENCE OF GNOSTICISM ON CHRISTIANITY. By the Rev. G. B. Cheever, New-York,	253	DR. I. NORDHEIMER, ON THE USE AND OMISSION OF THE HEBREW ARTICLE IN SOME IMPORTANT PASSAGES OF SCRIPTURE,	404
Tenets and Discipline of the Manichæans,	261	Prof. Stuart's Letter,	404
Antiquity of the Sources of Gnosticism,	269	Dr. Nordheimer's Reply,	412
Causes of the Spread and Power of Gnosticism,	282	ART. VIII. REVIEW OF ROBINSON'S BIBLICAL RESEARCHES. By Rev. Charles Hall, New-York,	419
Influence on Christianity,	287	ART. IX. THE NESTORIANS. REVIEW OF DR. GRANT'S THEORY OF THE LOST TRIBES. By Prof. E. Robinson, D. D., Theol. Sem., New-York,	454
Gnosticism in the Romish Church,	293	Letter from the Rev. J. Perkins,	457
ART. II. REVIEW OF CLARK'S SERMONS. By Rev. Prof. G. Shepard, Theol. Sem., Bangor, Me.	297	ART. X. CRITICAL NOTICES.	
ART. III. PSYCHO-PHYSIOLOGY, VIEWED IN ITS CONNECTION WITH THE RELIGIOUS EMOTIONS. By Prof. S. Adams, Illinois Col., Jacksonville, Illinois,	321	1. Davies' Sermons,	482
ART. IV. THE A POSTERIORI ARGUMENT FOR THE BEING OF GOD. By the Rev. Prof. L. P. Hickok, Western Reserve Col., Hudson, Ohio,	350	2. Stuart's New Testament Grammar,	483
ART. V. REMARKS IN REPLY TO THE QUESTIONS OF "INQUIRER;" Am. Bib. Repos. for April, 1840, (Continued). By Rev. Prof. L. Woods, D. D., Theol. Sem., Andover, Mass.	365	3. Bush's Notes on Exodus,	484
ART. VI. REVIEW OF QUINCY'S HISTORY OF HARVARD UNIVERSITY (Continued). By one of the Professors of Yale College,	384	4. Trumbull's Autobiography,	486
ART. VII. CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN PROF. M. STUART AND		5. Sermons by Contributors to the "Tracts for the Times,"	488
		6. Kendrick's Greek Introduction,	489
		7. Hitchcock's Elementary Geology,	490
		8. Buckingham's America,	491
		9. Stone's Life and Times of Red-Jacket,	495
		10. Philosophy of the Plan of Salvation,	496
		11. Miss Sedgwick's Letters from abroad,	497
		12. Perkins' Higher Arithmetic,	498
		13. James' Widow Directed,	498
		14. Buck's Religious Anecdotes,	499
		15. Smyth's Prelatical Doctrine Examined,	499
		16. Smyth's Ecclesiastical Catechism,	500
		17. Additional Notices,	501
		ART. XI. RECENT LITERARY INTELLIGENCE,	503

ERRATA.

Page 314, line 21, for nothing read "nothing.
 " " " 25, for like " like."

THE
AMERICAN
BIBLICAL REPOSITORY.

JULY, 1841.

SECOND SERIES, NO. XI.—WHOLE NO. XLIII.

ARTICLE I.

THE PRIMITIVE STATE OF MANKIND.

An attempt to prove that the original or most ancient condition of the human family was CIVILIZED, and not SAVAGE.

By Philip Lindsley, D. D., President of the University of Nashville, Tennessee.

[Continued from Vol. IV., page 298.]

I HAVE said that it can be proved from REASON, SCRIPTURE, and HISTORY, that the primitive state of the human race was *civilized*. I have shown how reason, prior to any investigation of facts, confirms the position, and how unreasonable is every other hypothesis. I have exhibited the scriptural account of man's creation; and exposed the absurdity of supposing that he could have proceeded from the hand of an infinitely wise, good and powerful Being, mature in his corporeal faculties, and yet destitute of mental furniture, or deficient in wisdom and intellect. Or, in other words, that he should have been formed only a *full-grown infant*; and, in that helpless condition, have been left by his Creator to grope his way in this new world, friendless, ignorant, unprotected—without a guide or instructor to aid in the gradual development of his rational powers, and in the attainment of that knowledge and skill which his situation imperiously demanded from the beginning; and without which he must either soon have perished,

or remained forever in a degraded and brutish condition. I have shown that Scripture, so far from countenancing any such representation of his original state and character, does directly and most clearly contradict it. I have rapidly sketched his early history, and brought under review the several facts recorded by the pen of inspiration calculated to illustrate this dark period of human society,—extending from the creation to the deluge. I have followed the same safe and infallible guide, from this *second* commencement of our wayward race, to the building of the tower of Babel: and in all this progress through the lapse and the revolutions of nearly eighteen centuries, we have discovered no trace of *savage* life upon the earth.

All the *data* with which we are furnished, and all the analogical reasoning which these data suggest go to the establishment of the proposition, that man existed from the beginning in a state of civilization, with very many, if not all, of the arts and improvements which usually distinguish and adorn such a state; and that he continued in this state down to the period just specified. I have also shown it to be highly probable that, soon after the dispersion of mankind from the fruitful plains of Shinar, they began in many places to degenerate; that, while the arts flourished and extended along the banks of the Tigris, the Euphrates and the Nile—upon the eastern and southern shores of the Mediterranean Sea—in the intermediate and adjacent countries—and perhaps far into India and the East—they were either totally or nearly lost by the numerous colonies which migrated, under inauspicious circumstances, into more barren, ungenial and inhospitable climes, especially where all future intercourse between the colonies and the parent stock was rendered difficult or impracticable. I have shown how easy it is for men to degenerate into savages;—that this is a very natural process and of frequent occurrence;—that we everywhere behold families and individuals, even in the midst of the most refined society, and within sight of our proudest institutions of science and noblest monuments of art, ignorant, degraded and removed but a single step from the savage of the wilderness; that it requires the constant care and studious discipline of parents and teachers for many years, to train up children to habits of industry, good order and common civility of deportment,—to make them respectable farmers, mechanics and tradesmen; much more to imbue their minds with science and literature, to qualify them for distinction and

eminence in the liberal arts and professions, and for all the various walks and departments of honorable life and elegant pursuit, which are supposed to be worthy of the ambition of the most exalted genius.

Let children grow up without any portion of this culture, and they will be but little the better or wiser for having been born in a land of light and knowledge. In this respect, the son of a philosopher is on a level with the son of a beggar; and, *a. priori*, it is just as likely that the child of a Cherokee warrior should become, under the same or similar advantages of education, an ornament to the republic of letters, as it is that the child of the President of the United States should be thus distinguished. *Cæteris paribus*, it is education alone that constitutes the difference between one individual and another. And this same tedious, painful process of tuition and training must be repeated with every generation. Wherever it is relaxed or intermitted, there will appear a corresponding declension or degeneracy. Knowledge cannot be inherited, like property. And none of us will ever be the wiser for the attainments of our ancestors, though we could number in the proud catalogue all the Bacons and Aristotles that have ever lived, unless we pursue a similar laborious course of study and self-cultivation in order to reach the same eminence. All this is sufficiently obvious; though seldom taken into the account by those who speculate on the subject of human improvement.

There is no golden or royal road to science; and yet, somehow or other, we are constantly deluding ourselves with the fancy, that, as the world grows older, it must become wiser. That every new generation commences where the former left off, and has nothing to do, but to add to the stock already acquired. In one sense, this is true. It is certainly easier to travel in a beaten path than to discover or strike out a new one. It is easier to master a well-digested system of science than to contrive or invent a different or a better. And when an ardent, gifted, talented, enterprising individual shall have mastered what is known, he may possibly advance into the unknown, and contribute something to the general or common fund of human knowledge. But then he must first go through the drudgery of an apprenticeship. He must labor hard, and labor long, in order to become initiated in the profound mysteries which have exercised the wit and occupied the lives of

those who have gone before him. How few, after all, have ever comprehended the science of a Newton—much less improved or enlarged it! How few, among the thousands of erudite and accomplished scholars of modern times, can be named with Sir William Jones in the field of universal literature! And upon whom has fallen the mantle of the recently departed Davy, and Cuvier, and La Place, and Bowditch?

Now this train of remark will apply to every degree of excellence, in every department of knowledge, and to every art and vocation of common life. It shows at once the difficulty of keeping the world up to the mark (if I may so express it,) which it has actually reached, and the facility with which it may recede or decline from it. And were it not for the art of printing (but recently invented), which perpetuates and widely diffuses every novel discovery and improvement; and which has rendered the vast stores of ancient literature and science easily accessible to all; our own age might have witnessed as barbarous a neglect of the philosophers of the last, as those of Babylon and Egypt and Greece were successively doomed to experience.

I have said that it is impossible for men in a savage state ever to advance, by their own unassisted efforts, to civilization and refinement. The history of every savage tribe, from the most remote ages in which savage life has been known to the present moment, bears testimony to the fact. It is now more than 300 years since Columbus discovered our own continent:—but the American savages are, at this day, as distant from civilization as they were when the white man first began to encroach upon their forests, and to exhibit to their view the conveniences and comforts of European art and industry. And, in any case, where they have been tamed, enlightened and civilized, it has been owing to the persevering discipline and culture of the benevolent Christian missionary and teacher, who have generously devoted years to this philanthropic object. In general, too, they have succeeded only with the children of the savage; and that by withdrawing them wholly from their native associates, and by educating them precisely as other children are educated. In all the regions of the old world which are known ever to have been inhabited by barbarous and savage tribes, but which are now civilized and polished, it is easy to show from whence, in what way, and at what period, they severally received the arts and polish of civilized

life ; and that, in every instance, they were indebted to *others more improved than themselves* for all their acquisitions. From analogy, we may and must conclude that such will ever be the order of events.

The Mexicans and Peruvians of the new world furnish no exception to the rule. We know very little of their history. We cannot tell whence they derived the few rude arts, which, it is admitted, they possessed when first visited by the Spaniards. It cannot be proved that they had ever been destitute of those arts. The probability is, that these were the remnant which they inherited from their ancestors, who had migrated from the mother country (the original fountain of all the arts), under more favorable auspices, than did those of the neighboring tribes in either North or South America ; or, what is more probable, that the latter, in their wanderings, had degenerated and sunk lower in the descending scale than the former. But after all that has been urged in favor of the Mexicans and Peruvians, it can hardly be conceded, that a people, who had not the use of iron in any form among them—who, though possessing the richest mines of gold and silver, knew not how to work them or to extract the pure metal from the ore, and had no more of these precious commodities than what they chanced to find in a virgin state, and who were conquered by a handful of needy and desperate adventurers—could prefer any just claims to the character of *civilized*.

It has been said by Dr. Robertson and others, that the aborigines of this vast continent must have arrived from a country destitute of the useful and necessary arts, such as the knowledge of working iron, for instance ; because these arts can never be lost. Now, in opposition to this whole theory, we have proved from Scripture, that iron was in common use long before the deluge ; that Noah and his family must have known and did actually exercise many of the arts confessedly belonging to a civilized state ; and that in the countries first settled after the flood, these arts have always flourished ; and, consequently, that the fact of any people's existing, on the face of the globe, ignorant of these arts, clearly proves that, at some period, no matter how remote, they must have lost them. If Noah were really the father of the whole human race, and if any portion of his descendants can be found wholly destitute of those arts of primary necessity which he undoubtedly had, and which he imparted to his immediate posterity ; then it follows, that these

necessary arts may have been and must have been utterly lost by such portion of his descendants as are now found without them. It is no matter then whether the American Indians lost them before they reached these shores or long after their arrival hither. The position of the learned historian is untenable. And it cannot fairly enter into the question of the original peopling of this hemisphere.*

III. HISTORY. But how does history confirm our view of the primeval and early state of mankind? Does history accord either with the deductions of reason or the representations of Scripture, as I have exhibited them? Do not the Greek and Roman historians *seem* to convey a different account of the matter? Does not the voice of antiquity proclaim that man was once rude, barbarous and savage? Here, I acknowledge, we are beset with some apparent difficulties in the outset. These, I think, could be easily dissipated, were it not for the prescriptive dominion which the classic authorities have ob-

* Mr. Bancroft, in the third volume of his History of the United States, concludes that America was peopled from eastern Asia; that the Mongolian and Americo-Indian races are identical in origin; that the epoch of their divergence or separation was at a period so remote, that the peculiar habits, institutions and culture of the aborigines must be regarded as all their own, or as indigenous. "By this hypothesis (says a writer in the North American Review, No. 110) he extricates the question from the embarrassment caused by the ignorance which the aborigines have manifested in the use of iron, milk, etc. known to the Mongol hordes, but which he, of course, supposes were not known, at the time of the migration." When did the Mongols acquire or lose this knowledge? If Noah and his children possessed it, and if both the Mongols and Indians are his descendants, then it must have been *lost*—at least by some of them.

I incline to the opinion, that most of the American tribes are descended from Ham; and that they migrated to this continent, by way of Africa and the Atlantic ocean, soon after the dispersion at Babel. My *notes* on this part of the subject, must wait for *room and leave*.*

* We shall be happy to allow Dr. Lindsley both "room and leave," within reasonable limits, to bring out the result of his Notes, which we have no doubt are valuable, on the subject which he has here introduced. EDITORS.

tained over our philosophy, as well as over our ordinary habits of reasoning and reflective associations. We have been misled both by their facts and their poetry.

Let it be recollected that the aborigines of Greece and Italy were a barbarous—perhaps savage people. (We shall hereafter see how they became civilized.) It was natural, as they advanced in the arts, for them to conclude that their own primitive condition was really the primitive or original condition of mankind. At any rate, their poets, while giving the reins to romantic fancy, and mingling fact with fiction, delighted in painting the scenes and in celebrating the exploits of savage life and savage daring; in tracing the progress of human improvement from the rudest beginnings; and by the witchery of harmonious numbers, imparting beauty and order and life and reality to imagination's wildest figments. They never dreamed of a more ancient or more cultivated model of social existence than their own limited domestic sphere of observation and experience supplied or suggested. These worthy votaries and favorites of Apollo and the Muses, though no conjurors, seem to have been well aware of their high vocation, and to have very liberally availed themselves of the *license* and the *inspiration* accorded to them, by common consent, as professors of the "art divine." Hence, among other "*miracula speciosa*," by the magic spell of their poetic enchantments, they caused their ancestors to spring up, full grown and completely armed, from dragon's teeth or from their mother earth: and thus conferred upon the natives the distinctive and flattering epithet or title of *earth-born*; which was the more grateful to their national vanity, as it excluded or concealed all obligation to a foreign origin or to foreign wisdom.*

The agency of the gods was deemed necessary to restrain and mitigate the furious passions of these presumptuous and

* The Athenians assumed to themselves the appellation *αὐτόχθονες*, as though they had been produced from the same earth which they inhabited: and as the ancients commonly denominated themselves *Γηγενεῖς*, sons of the earth, the Athenians took the name of *Τέρμιγγες*, grasshoppers. In allusion to this designation, many of them wore golden grasshoppers in their hair, as an ornament of distinction, and a badge of their antiquity; because those insects were thought to have sprung from the ground.

cruel sons of *Terra*; who, in some instances during "the heroic ages," seem to have outwitted and vanquished Jupiter himself. However, in process of time, by the kindly teachings of Bacchus, Mercury, Janus, Vulcan, Apollo, Ceres, Minerva, and the rest of their good-natured and obliging deities, male and female, these vagrant robbers and cut-throats were converted into honest agriculturists, gentle shepherds and clever artisans.

Thus the poets preoccupied the ground: and long before the sober historian began his chronicle of humble life, they had given universal currency and reputation and sanctity to the theogony and mythology which they themselves invented, or fabricated from the popular superstitions and legends of their own country, or from such historical and biographical facts or mythical traditions as they had collected among the polished nations of the East. The machinery and fables and fancies of poetry soon passed for realities; and thus became associated and incorporated with whatever was held as true and sacred in science and religion. When the historian at length appeared, and commenced the record of his country's fame, it was natural for him to look back into ages that were past, and to search for the materials of a regular narrative from the earliest period to his own times. And here he was compelled to have recourse to the prevalent poetic faith of his countrymen, or else to do violence to their prejudices and vanity and superstition, by a bold rejection of their whole system. The latter was not to be expected. Nor did he venture upon the rash experiment. He adopted the vulgar notions which time and poetry had sanctioned and hallowed. He traced their own origin—and gratuitously referred the origin of other nations—up to a period, more or less indefinitely remote, when the arts and manners of civilized life were yet to be acquired. The same causes also led the philosophers, in their speculations, to erect systems upon a similar basis. With most of these, man was assumed to have been at first but a little in advance of the brute with which he associated in a common forest.* Thus all things conspired to render this doctrine plausible, and to give it a passport to universal acceptance. It became a part of the national creed of the Greeks; and, after them, of the Romans.

Still we, now and then, behold the feeble glimmerings of a

* Modern philosophers have commonly started from the same point.

few scattered rays from the sun of truth beaming through the darkening mists of poetic illusion and philosophical refinement. A golden age—a happier state—a brighter, purer, more enlightened period sometimes inspired the Muse's lay, and seemed to point to that Eden of innocence and bliss of which the Bible tells us, and of which some faint traditional remains had escaped the general wreck of historic truth. The gods too, say they, taught the people agriculture and the arts. Was not this merely disguising the fact that they owed all to foreigners? By their own admission, then, they received extraordinary aid and instruction from some quarter; and it matters not, so far as our argument is concerned, whether the divinity interposed to rescue them from ignorance and barbarism, or whether they derived the same favors from wiser mortals, or from those nations which they denominated barbarians. For thus the Greeks, be it remembered, flattered their own vanity, and manifested their contempt for all other nations, however polished or powerful, by this sweeping sentence of degradation, implied in the contemptuous appellation—*barbarians*. All their writers, whether poets, historians or philosophers, liberally employed it on every occasion. And thus also did the Romans, in regard to all other nations except the Greeks;—for to these, they acknowledged themselves debtors exclusively for their own literature, arts, laws and civility. By this preposterous and arrogant procedure, they effectually kept out of view the claims of every other people to greater antiquity and to profounder science than their own. An odious epithet, applied to those whom we fear or hate, or affect to despise, has ever proved the most cogent species of logic which can be addressed to the populace. The Grecian sages, as we shall see, knew better.

But what, after all, do their historians say on this subject? Their conjectures ought to go for nothing: their statements, built on fable and fiction and national prejudice and vanity, must go for nothing. What they themselves saw and heard and examined, and what they learned from authentic sources, we will believe. Thus far their authority deserves our respectful consideration and claims our assent, but no further. Does Herodotus then, the father of profane history, tell us of barbarous nations, of savage tribes and hordes? Yes: and there were many such in his day, as there were in the days of Polybius, Diodorus Siculus, Cæsar, Livy and Tacitus; and as there have been ever since. But what says Herodotus respecting Assyria,

Phœnicia and Egypt? He found them, indeed, rapidly losing that proud pre-eminence which had so long distinguished them among the nations of the earth. Still he everywhere beheld enough of magnificence and grandeur to overwhelm him with astonishment; and to render perfectly credible all that was told him of their ancient greatness. He surveyed, as it were, but the ruins of those mighty empires which had flourished through a period of nearly two thousand years, unrivalled in arts and science and letters and power and splendor, and which had already diffused the light and comforts of civilization to many rude and distant nations.

Did Herodotus ascertain that the Babylonians or Egyptians had ever been a wandering, fierce, brutish, hunting race, similar to the savage or half-savage tribes then existing in various parts of Asia, Europe and Africa? He did not. Nor is there a single fragment of *authentic* history in the world, which intimates that those celebrated nations had ever been destitute of the usual arts and intelligence of civilized life. I repeat, that the romance of poetry is not to enter into the account: nor is the metaphysic of philosophy to weigh against fact. In the days of Hesiod and Homer, those empires were in the zenith of their glory. That they had ever been otherwise than polished and enlightened and great and powerful, the Greeks did not know and could not prove. Their poets, philosophers and historians, who, at later periods, travelled far and resided long in the East, appear to have learned but little of their early history.

We have then no historical evidence that man was ever found in a savage state, or in a state at all approaching the savage, in the countries specified. All the evidence of history goes to establish the contrary opinion. As far back as we can trace the history of the Assyrians, Phœnicians and Egyptians, we find them civilized, and that too in a very high degree. Now, what right have we—supposing we could extend our researches no further—to infer that they were ever otherwise than civilized? or that their ancestors had been savages? None at all: unless it could be proved that these were not the most ancient nations in the world; and that the nations from which they sprung had been originally savage. This, it is apprehended, none will attempt to prove. History then confirms the argument grounded on Scripture and Reason.

Should it be objected, that the proof from history is merely negative; that though it establish the fact of civilization in the

countries already mentioned, up to the remotest period to which it reaches, yet that it leaves us in the dark in regard to their earliest condition and character: I answer, that it is clear, direct and positive, so far as it touches on the subject. And this is sufficient for our purpose. If history cannot point us to the time and the place *when* and *where* the most ancient inhabitants of the earth were savages, then history utterly fails to countenance the system of those who maintain that the *savage* was the *primeval* state of mankind. If history represent the most ancient people ever known in the world as civilized at the time when its records commence, then does history yield all the support to our system of which it is capable.

It is much to be lamented that all the ancient archives of Nineveh and Babylon and Tyre and Thebes and Memphis have perished. For, that they once possessed very ample histories and annals, we have abundant testimony. Their loss is but poorly supplied by the comparatively modern Greek and Jewish historians, or by the Christian fathers. It is to the Bible chiefly, that we must have recourse for information relative to all that vast period which elapsed anterior to the time at which Herodotus commences his elaborate and interesting history.

Here it may be proper to remark, that after the more learned of the Greeks had ascertained their own origin, and had become convinced of their obligations to Egypt for letters, arts and philosophy, they then indulged in a strain of eulogy and admiration bordering on extravagance whenever they had occasion to speak of their intercourse with that marvellous country. Nor did they hesitate to assign to their recently discovered instructors and benefactors the most remote, as well as the most resplendent antiquity. "For my own part (says Herodotus) I am of opinion, that the Egyptians did not commence their origin with the Delta, but from the first existence of the human race." *Euterpe*, 15.

But, in the absence of every other source or means of information, let us follow the sure guidance of revelation. Or, if any further aid from revelation be refused us, inasmuch as our appeal has been made to history; let us recur to Moses and the prophets merely as historians, and allow them to be as trustworthy as other historians, neither more nor less. And *less* credible, they will not be deemed even by those who deny them the infallibility of plenary inspiration.

Moses informs us, that, about one hundred years after the

deluge, agreeably to the Hebrew chronology, the earth was divided among the descendants of Noah according to their families, tongues and nations.* In this grand division—made, we presume, by Noah, pursuant to the divine command—Shem had the south of Asia; and the Jews, Arabs, Persians, Hindoos, with the inhabitants of farther India and the Asiatic Isles, are numbered among his descendants. Japheth obtained the northern and central parts of Asia, the Isles of the Gentiles or Europe; and, more recently, large portions of America. China, according to Sir William Jones, was originally peopled by a colony of Hindoos, with which their neighbors and conquerors, the Tartars, afterwards intermixed. Japan was very anciently peopled from China, and was subsequently subdued by the Tartars, etc. So that China and Japan are now inhabited by a mixed race descending from Shem and Japheth. To Ham was allotted Africa, together with certain districts of Asia. The mighty empires of Assyria and Egypt, the commercial republics of Sidon, Tyre and Carthage, the Philistines and other nations of Palestine or Canaan were his inheritance and his posterity. From him also are probably descended the American Indians.

In the tenth chapter of Genesis, we have a particular account of “the generations and the sons of Noah,” and of the beginnings of many cities and nations. Thus, about one hundred years after the deluge, *Nimrod*, the son of Cush and grandson of Ham, commenced his career in Shinar as a mighty warrior and conqueror. Among other cities of less note, he built or began to build Babylon, afterwards “the glory of kingdoms, and the beauty of the Chaldees’ excellency.” *Ashur*, son of Shem and grandson of Noah, built Nineveh, and gave name to the empire of Assyria. Or if, instead of the common

* Whether this division took place before or after the building of Babel is disputed. Bryant says, “that there were two memorable occurrences in ancient history, which the learned have been apt to consider as merely one event. The first was a regular migration of mankind in general by divine appointment: the second was the dispersion of the Cuthites, and their adherents, who had acted in defiance of this ordination;” that the Cuthites, under their leader *Nimrod*, refused to emigrate, built Babel, were punished, and scattered abroad into different parts, etc. Hence the fables of the Titans and Giants, etc.

version of Gen. 10: 11, "out of that land went forth Ashur, and builded Nineveh," we adopt the marginal reading, which is preferred by Bochart and other learned critics, the text will stand thus: "Out of that land he [Nimrod] went forth into Assyria and built Nineveh." This is probably the true reading. It better accords with the context, and with the subsequent fortunes of that remarkable city, and of Ham's posterity generally.* *Ninus*, its reputed founder, and from whom it was named according to oriental tradition, may have been a son of Nimrod, or merely another name for Nimrod himself. But however all this may be, there is no doubt that Nineveh was built at this time, or about one hundred and thirty years after the flood; and that it soon became an exceedingly great, magnificent and renowned metropolis.

Mizraim (i. e. the family of Mezr), son of Ham, peopled Egypt. Throughout Africa and the East, Egypt is to this day called *Mezr*, and the Egyptians *Mezraim*. Another son of Ham, *Canaan*, peopled the land of Canaan, afterwards Palestine, or the promised land—the future home of the Israelites. *Sidon*, son of Canaan, gave name to the city Sidon, and was the father of the Sidonians. *Uz*, grandson of Shem, is supposed to have settled in Cœlo-Syria, and to have been the founder of Damascus. This famous city, by whomsoever built, belongs undoubtedly to the earliest ages: and it has never ceased to act a conspicuous part at every epoch of oriental history, from Abraham's time to the present day.

We thus behold the inhabitants of this new world, going forward with spirit and enterprise to build cities and to form civil communities, as soon as their numbers would permit. And the grandest cities which have ever existed, at least since the deluge, were founded soon after that event. Nay, they actually reached the highest pitch of power and splendor within a very few centuries, some of them, probably, long before the death of Noah. Profane history does not carry us back to the period at which Nineveh and Babylon and fifty other cities were *not* large and splendid. Nor can it tell us *when* or by *whom* they were built; or what were the several steps in their progress to greatness. The Bible informs us only *when* the foundations were laid. But the Bible ever after speaks of them as

* Bryant dissents from Bochart, and very ingeniously defends the common version.

large and magnificent cities. That many of them were so within a very few years cannot be doubted. As soon as there were people enough in the world to build cities, it might be expected that they would build them. And that there might have been a population of hundreds of millions, has been shown by the calculations of sundry eminently learned and judicious writers. Should any persons, however, be inclined to demur or to cavil on this score, they are welcome to all the benefit which the chronology of the Samaritan Pentateuch and the Septuagint version can afford them.* That cities should have been built during the lifetime of a single monarch or patriarch, or by a single generation, need not surprise us. Every body knows the history of Alexandria in Egypt—and of the scores of cities built by the successors of the Macedonian conqueror. St. Petersburg too is a modern instance of a similar kind. And as to American cities—they grow up so rapidly and so abundantly, that no mortal pretends to an acquaintance with their statistics or hardly with their geographical positions.

But the further we ascend towards the commencement of human enterprise, the greater do we find the combination of skill and effort in the production of imposing and colossal works of art. Probably the labor bestowed on the tower of Babel—certainly that bestowed on many a structure in Egypt, say a pyramid, or labyrinth, or temple—would suffice to build a modern city of very respectable dimensions. The truth is, for several centuries after the flood, something of the antediluvian spirit and fashion seems to have prevailed among mankind. Every thing was designed and executed on a grand scale, and in the most durable style. It is immaterial at present to inquire what could have induced men, in those early ages, to unite in the construction of such massive and costly edifices. Whether it was the result of voluntary action on the part of the laborers, or whether it was the effect of despotic power, is of no consequence to the main purpose of our investigation. Were we to admit that the whole was the work of slaves—that all the mighty monuments of Asiatic and African grandeur were the works of slaves—still, this would no more prove a general deficiency in science or the arts, than the existence of slavery in our own *free*, happy and *Christian* country, implies a want of

* See Dr. Hales's *New Analysis of Chronology*; and Dr. Russell's *Connection of Sacred and Profane History*.

knowledge, skill and enterprise in the nation at large. If the ancient despots of the East possessed slaves in sufficient numbers to convert mountains of granite into temples and statues, it would not follow, either that the *master spirits*, who planned and directed such gigantic labors, were destitute of talent and science, or that the slaves themselves were in a state of misery and degradation without a parallel in modern times, even in the most enlightened and most signally favored monarchies and republics.

Conceding all that has been said and written about the wretchedness of the people employed in those extravagant enterprises of ancient vanity and ambition to be strictly true, it will not follow that those people, however wretched they may have been, were any more wretched than certain classes of *human creatures* in other countries—than the peasantry, the serfs, the vassals, the villains, of Christian Europe—to say nothing of the African *anomaly* in Christian America; or of the baser castes throughout India under the gentle protection of their most gracious Christian benefactors. The moral and political condition of the great mass of the (so called) lower orders of the people, under the different European governments, is probably elevated but little above that of the subjects or the slaves of the former lords of Egypt and Assyria.

Multitudes of human beings may be found, all the world over, engaged in pursuits, or doomed to occupations, not a whit more rational or grateful or beneficial, than were the wildest, most extravagant or most onerous ever devised or imposed by the tyranny or superstition of antiquity. Were men, employed in the construction of a pyramid, for instance—with pay or without it, as slaves or as hired servants—likely to have been subjected to greater hardships and privations, or to a more arbitrary treatment, than are the soldiers in the ranks of a modern army? or than the sailors on board a man of war, or before the mast of a merchant ship? or than the operatives in an English cotton factory or upon an American cotton plantation?

We do injustice, therefore, to the ancient Orientals, when, from the assumed misery and servile condition of the lower classes, we infer a corresponding and universal degradation of the human mind; when we argue, that, because the many appear to have been ignorant and depressed, therefore the few, or the whole must have been equally destitute of intelligence, sagacity, wisdom, science and enterprise; that Abraham,

Joseph, Moses and Job were not superior to the vulgar nomad of the desert, or to the murmuring cowardly Hebrew herdsman. We must utterly eschew all our republican logic and prejudices of this sort, while we listen to the truthful voice of universal experience. The great masses of mankind have, at all times, been controlled and directed and fashioned by the wisdom or the cunning or the will of the few. And it is the character of the *few* which invariably fixes the historic character of every age and of every country. The light of science, indeed, may be diffused over the globe, like the light of the sun; while the millions who enjoy the benefits of both are as incapable of appreciating the one as of comprehending the other. The universities of the Nile and the Euphrates—in the former of which were graduated the illustrious Grecian masters, Thales, Pythagoras, Eudoxus and Plato—may have been surrounded by illiteracy and rudeness, as were the universities of the Ilissus and the Tiber centuries later, and as are those of the Cam and the Isis, of the Hudson and the Potomac, at the present day. No doubt, the Newtons and the Lockes, the Miltons and the Seldens, the Fultons and the Franklins lived and labored then, as they have done since and are doing still, among a people not quite their peers in intellect or accomplishments. Such extremes and contrasts have always and everywhere prevailed. And they do not affect the question about the civilization of any country, ancient or modern.

Thus, France is a civilized country; and yet there are millions of Frenchmen who do not know the alphabet. But, in thus applying the term *civilized*, we do not stop to discriminate between the courtly Parisian *savant* and the roughest provincial peasant. We pronounce the French nation, a civilized nation, and justly;—as we do the American republic—without excepting the three or four hundred thousand white persons over twenty years of age, who, according to the recent census, cannot write or read. For even these, uncultivated as they are, rise incomparably above the wild Indian and stupid Hottentot. And we mean the same thing when we speak of the civilization of ancient Egypt or Phœnicia. The whole people were civilized, as contrasted with savages; whatever distinctions may have obtained among themselves, or however vast the distance between either classes or individuals.

Again, there are diverse *forms* as well as *degrees* of civilization. Asiatic civilization has assumed a different type from

the European ; and, for centuries past, has ranked much lower in degree. The civilization of China is very unlike that of Germany, and probably much inferior to it. Yet, no person would confound the Chinese with the aborigines of New Holland, any more than he would consign the Germans to the same category with the natives of Congo and Oregon. I resort to this species of illustration to avoid any misapprehension about the precise meaning of the word *civilization*. Of this word, I have attempted no definition. I use it as custom has authorized. I speak of civilized nations and savage tribes, as existing facts, well known and universally understood. If there be any nations or tribes in a transition or doubtful state—so that they would not, by common consent, be assigned to the one or the other of these grand divisions—I leave them out of the account.

I assert then, that the most ancient Egyptians known to history were civilized : as truly so, as were ever the Greeks or the Romans, or as now are the Britons or the Italians. With forms and degrees, I repeat, I have no controversy. Pass what sentence you please upon the remnants and ruins of Egyptian architecture, sculpture and painting ; you will never pronounce them the work of savages. The builders of the stupendous temples at Thebes and Tentyra may possibly suffer somewhat in comparison with the artists who designed and embellished St. Peter's and St. Paul's at Rome and London ; but no man will be hardy enough to insinuate that the former were savages.

But to return, for a moment, to the Scriptural history. Whoever will peruse the Mosaic account of mankind, during the first ages after the flood, will discover no trace of barbarism, and no deficiency in the arts of civilized life. So early as the time of Abraham, we find a king in Egypt of the common name of Pharaoh, and a civil polity established, apparently of the same general character with that which prevailed in the days of Joseph and Moses, and which probably continued until the Persian conquest. The kingdom abounded in agricultural products, and afforded ample relief to strangers in seasons of famine. Moses represents the sovereign, who reigned at the time of the patriarch's temporary sojourn in that then most fertile and hospitable country, as a powerful and magnificent monarch, surrounded by his princes and officers of state, maintaining a splendid and luxurious court, and exhibiting also

much more magnanimity and moral principle than is usually to be met with in crowned heads among the ancients or the moderns. Several writers, particularly Goguet and Warburton, have contrasted the circumstances of Abraham's journey into Egypt and of his dismissal by Pharaoh, with those of a similar adventure on the part of Isaac with Abimelech, styled king of Gerar,—in which the superiority of an Egyptian monarch over a petty Philistine *sheik* or chief is strikingly manifested.

In the days of Jacob, the caravan of Ishmaelite merchants from Gilead, “with their camels bearing spicery, and balm, and myrrh,” and their ready purchase of Joseph as a slave, sufficiently indicate the nature of the market which Egypt then presented for the rarest commodities, as well as the safe and regular manner in which the over-land foreign commerce was conducted. We read of a captain of Pharaoh's guard, of a chief butler and baker, and other important functionaries—of a distinct priesthood—of a prison, “where the king's prisoners were bound”—of “magicians and wise men”—and of sundry curious facts and incidents, rather casually glanced at than directly stated in the general narrative. “And Pharaoh took off his ring from his hand, and put it upon Joseph's hand, and arrayed him in vestures of fine linen, and put a gold chain about his neck; and he made him to ride in the second chariot which he had,” etc.; all evincing much luxury and refinement. And in the cities for the laying up of stores and provisions for the approaching seven years of famine, we see the effects of wise government and of great national opulence. Soon after Joseph's death, we find the power and grandeur of the kingdom very significantly illustrated in the employment of the enslaved Israelites in building treasure cities, and in preparing materials for splendid public edifices. “Indeed (adds Warburton), if we may believe St. Paul, this kingdom was chosen by God to be the scene of all his wonders, in support of his elect people, for this very reason, that through the celebrity of so famed an empire, the power of the true God might be spread abroad, and strike the observation of the whole habitable world. ‘For the Scripturesaith unto Pharaoh, Even for this same purpose have I raised thee up, that I might show my power in thee, and that my name might be declared throughout all the earth.’” Rom. 9: 17.

The description of the Egyptian priesthood by Diodorus Siculus is worthy of notice in this connection. “The whole

country being divided into three parts ; the first belongs to the body of priests, an order in the highest reverence among their countrymen, for their piety to the gods, and their consummate wisdom, acquired by the best education, and the closest application to the improvement of the mind. With their revenues they supply all Egypt with public sacrifices ; they support a number of inferior officers, and maintain their own families : for the Egyptians think it utterly unlawful to make any change in their public worship ; but hold that every thing should be administered by their priests, in the same constant, invariable manner. Nor do they deem it at all fitting that those, to whose cares the public is so much indebted, should want the common necessities of life : for the priests are constantly attached to the person of the king, as his coadjutors, counsellors and instructors in the most weighty matters. For it is not among them as with the Greeks, where one single man or woman exercises the office of the priesthood. Here a body or society is employed in sacrificing and other rites of public worship, who transmit their profession to their children. This order, likewise, is exempt from all charges and imposts, and holds the second honors, under the king, in the public administration.” Moses also tells us that the Egyptian priests were a distinct and superior order, and had an established landed revenue ; that when the famine raged so severely that the people were compelled to sell their estates to the crown for bread, the priests still retained theirs unalienated, and were supplied with corn gratuitously from the public stores. “ Only the land of the priests bought he not : for the priests had a portion assigned them of Pharaoh, and did eat their portion which Pharaoh gave them : wherefore they sold not their lands.” Gen. 47 : 22. Diodorus gives us the reason of this indulgence, and corroborates the Scriptural history ; or, rather, is himself sustained by this venerable authority—although ignorant, probably, of its existence.

Herodotus says the inhabitants of Heliopolis were deemed in his time the most ingenious of all the Egyptians. The schools of its priesthood were famous for wisdom and learning. And Strabo, even so late as the beginning of the Christian era, speaks of certain stately edifices as still remaining in that ancient city, which, as it was reported, had formerly been occupied by the priests, who cultivated the studies of philosophy and astronomy. This statement is incidentally confirmed by

Moses. When Joseph was created *grand vizier* or prime minister of Egypt, Pharaoh "gave him to wife, Asenath, the daughter of Poti-phera, priest of On" or Heliopolis. All the circumstances of the case plainly show that the king was then disposed to do Joseph the highest honor: and the sound policy of this distinguished alliance is apparent from the passages already cited from the Greek historians. The sudden and extraordinary, elevation of a stranger, over the heads of the hereditary administrators of public affairs, might have proved a dangerous experiment. The introduction of Joseph, therefore, into their own priestly order by marriage, was probably the best, if not the only expedient, calculated to allay their envy and prejudices, and to secure their cordial support and co-operation.

It is worthy of remark also, that, throughout this whole period from Abraham to Moses, the Scripture represents Egypt as an entire kingdom under one monarch, and not as distributed into a number of petty independent sovereignties, as most modern historians, from the imperfect traditions detailed by the Greeks, would lead us to believe. That Egypt might, in after times, have been thus temporarily divided among several tyrants or competitors for the throne, or that the powerful nobles or military commanders might, during the reign of a weak prince or the minority of a young one, or at any other favorable crisis, have seized upon the crown and shared its honors among them, is very probable, and will account for the stories found in many writers about the confusions of ancient Egypt. Domestic feuds and animosities may have commenced at or soon after the exodus of the Israelites. At any rate, the prophets Isaiah and Ezekiel, centuries later, when predicting the desolation of Egypt by the Babylonians, speak of internal commotions and divisions as the principal cause of her deplorable weakness, and of her forty years' endurance of the most dreadful calamities ever inflicted upon a conquered enemy. "And I will set the Egyptians against the Egyptians; and they shall fight every one against his brother, and every one against his neighbor; city against city, and kingdom against kingdom." Is. 19: 2. "And I will make the land of Egypt desolate in the midst of the countries that are desolate, and her cities among the cities that are laid waste shall be desolate forty years: and I will scatter the Egyptians among the nations, and will disperse them through the countries." Ezek. 29: 12. We must not confound the early with the later history of Egypt.

Nor are we to forget that, however much of error or fiction may have found its way into their historical statements, the more intelligent and travelled Greeks, with one voice, assigned to Egypt both the remotest antiquity and the highest wisdom and learning. Herodotus says that the Egyptians were the wisest of all nations, and that they were never beholden for any thing to the Grecians; but on the contrary, that Greece had borrowed largely from Egypt. All the Hebrew records support the Grecian evidence for the extreme antiquity and pre-eminent wisdom of the Egyptians. Thus, Isaiah, in denouncing the divine judgments against this people: "Surely the princes of Zoan (or Tanis) are fools, the counsel of the wise counsellors of Pharaoh is become brutish: how say ye unto Pharaoh, I am the son of the wise, the son of ancient kings? Where are they? Where are thy wise men?" Is. 19: 12.

I transcribe the following paragraph from Warburton, chiefly as furnishing a curious specimen of a kind of reasoning which is always convenient to the system-maker, and in the main abundantly satisfactory to the general reader. "This superior nobility of the priests of On or Heliopolis seems to have been chiefly owing to their higher antiquity. Heliopolis, or the city of the Sun, was the place where that luminary was principally worshipped; and certainly, from the most early times: for Diodorus tells us that, 'the first gods of Egypt were the sun and moon:' the truth of which, all this laid together remarkably confirms. Now if we suppose, as is very reasonable, that the first established priests in Egypt were those dedicated to the sun at On, we shall not be at a loss to account for their titles of nobility. Strabo says, they were much given to astronomy; and this too we can easily believe: for what more likely than that they should be fond of the study of that system, over which their god presided, not only in his *moral* but in his *natural* capacity? For whether they received the doctrine from original tradition, or whether they invented it at hazard, which is more likely, in order to exalt this their visible god, by giving him the post of honor, it is certain they taught that the sun was in the centre of its system, and that all the other bodies moved round it, in perpetual revolutions. This noble theory came with the rest of the Egyptian learning into Greece, being carried thither by Pythagoras; who, it is remarkable, received it from CEnuphis, a priest of Heliopolis, and, after having given

the most distinguished lustre to his school, it sunk into obscurity, and suffered a total eclipse throughout a long succession of learned and unlearned ages; till these times relumed its ancient splendor, and immovably fixed it on the most unerring principles of science."

As to the very accommodating hypothesis or rather conjecture, that the Egyptian professors may have "invented at hazard" the sublime astronomical doctrine, taught in Greece by their accomplished pupil Pythagoras—a doctrine which never obtained currency among the Greeks—which subsequently, and after the lapse of more than twenty centuries, was revived by Copernicus, and finally demonstrated by Newton—the philosophers are heartily welcome to all the capital they can make of it. They must concede, at the least, that the Egyptian sages were shrewd and lucky *guessers*; and that their inventions *at hazard* were not always to be despised. With all becoming deference, however, to great names, and to superior erudition, I should venture to reverse the order; and to assume that their orthodox astronomical faith was grounded upon real science: and that the science preceded the popular superstition, and gave rise to it. *When* or *how* they acquired this wonderful science, which *we* are only just beginning to learn—whether they derived it from Noah, and he from the father and first great teacher of mankind—or whether some gifted Galileo or Newton among themselves was its happy author—it were bootless to speculate. It is much easier to account for its ultimate and total disappearance—even long before the superstition which it generated had, in any degree, relaxed its ghostly dominion over the popular mind. The science itself may never have passed the limits of the sacerdotal colleges and royal observatories where it was studied and cherished; while the superstition was diffused among all ranks and embraced by the whole people.

The science, moreover, may have become obsolete or been lost among its privileged guardians and depositaries prior even to the dissolution of their priestly order. These may have neglected their high vocation as teachers and students—as has often happened in similar corporations since—from indolence, from the absence of all external stimulus or exciting motive, or from luxurious habits of self-indulgence: and thereafter, they may have been content with the results, the tables, rules, formulæ and calculations, already provided by their more diligent and faithful predecessors. They might continue to know

the fact, and to believe the theory of the true solar system; just as multitudes of modern *gownsmen* know and believe, without being able to advance a single step towards the actual demonstration. At any rate, the science must have perished beneath the desolating sweep of the Persian invader, who madly sought to bury, in the ruins of the temple and the palace, the religion, the learning, the arts and the glory of Egypt. The superstition, indeed, survived the rage, the fire and the sword of the ruthless victor. But the light of science was utterly extinguished; and its votaries were silenced forever. The later Greeks had ample opportunities to witness all the revolting absurdities of the Egyptian idolatry; while they could hear only a faint traditionary whisper of that splendid intellectual inheritance which had once adorned, enriched and exalted the Egyptian name above every other in the ancient world.

But, inasmuch as the bigoted Persians destroyed or rather annihilated all the written records, the libraries, books, archives, chronicles, annals—all the scientific apparatus and collections—which had been accumulating undisturbed for two thousand years; we, forsooth, are not to believe that the Egyptians ever possessed either literature or science! And we should, no doubt, be equally incredulous about Egyptian art, were it not for the still living and still speaking witnesses in every part of the land, upon either bank of the mysterious Nile, from the cataracts to the Mediterranean. But for these stubborn monuments, we should very logically conclude, that the present half-human *Copts* are fair specimens of Pharaoh's wise men—the instructors of Moses and Cecrops, of Solon and Pythagoras! And we are the more especially predisposed to favor this mode of reasoning, since it is everywhere gravely asserted, that the East is unchangeable, and has never changed;—that habits, manners, usages, all things remain just as they were a score of centuries ago. So that whatever a galloping traveller or fashionable tourist happens to encounter or to espy, is incontinently jotted down as a veritable *fac simile* of what existed in the days of Abraham or Solomon;—as if invariable uniformity and absolute stability were predicable of regions which have undergone more revolutions, reverses, exterminating wars and plagues of all sorts—political, moral, religious and physical—than any other portions of the globe. It is time that this folly were rebuked, and that its abettors were sent to school.

I have said more of Egypt than my argument strictly demands. To show that Egypt was always civilized, and never otherwise—without claiming for it any extraordinary excellence or superiority—was abundantly sufficient to sustain the proposition which I have essayed to demonstrate.* Incidentally, I have adverted to a few particulars which seem to indicate a very high order and degree of civilization. And much more, tending to the same result, might easily be adduced. Ever since the temporary occupancy of Egypt by the French, under Napoleon, the ruins of her pristine grandeur have been a *study* for the most profoundly learned, sagacious and philosophical antiquarians of Europe. They have not only visited the several remarkable localities, but have patiently, perseveringly and laboriously explored, investigated, deciphered, measured, compared, classified—until they have become familiar with the aspect, features, magnitude, proportions and style of those marvellous creations, which have resisted and survived the convulsions and the Vandalism of a hundred generations; and which

* Bryant indeed maintains, that the Mizraim, with their brethren the sons of Phut, migrated to their place of allotment, the Upper Egypt, a long time before the rebellion at Babel; that they there led a simple, rude, half-savage kind of life for several ages; that they were at length conquered and civilized by their brethren the *Cuthites* (the Titanic brood, as he styles them), after they had been driven from Babylonia—etc.—His authorities, Diodorus Siculus among them, do not seem to warrant his hypothesis. But if admitted to be true, it would not invalidate our theory in the slightest degree. It would merely change a little the order of events. It would show that the first settlers in a part of Egypt had greatly degenerated for a season: and that they were afterwards instructed and reclaimed by a colony direct from the fatherland—the original seat and fountain of civilization. Should all our facts and reasoning about Egypt be questioned or rejected, still our main position remains impregnable and unaffected. It can never be demolished, until it be proved that there was a time when civilization was unknown, and nowhere existed; or when all the inhabitants of our globe were savages. The philosophy which traces the civilized up to the savage state, or which deduces the former from the latter, demands this: and nothing less will meet the demand. Otherwise, the whole affair is a mere “*controversia verbi*.”

seem destined to speak of the primeval ages and of the Pharaohs to the latest posterity. But into this tempting and opulent field, we must not venture. The pen and the pencil, however, have nobly accomplished their proper task; and volumes, full of instruction and of the most intensely exciting interest, are now within the reach of every man, who has the curiosity to read one of the most astonishing, as well as edifying passages in the history of our race. Not only do these recent researches fully confirm all the statements of the Hebrew and classical authors; but they add immensely to the previously conceded number and variety of arts and sciences, useful and liberal, which must have been cultivated and practised by the older Egyptians. It is difficult, indeed, to discover wherein they were deficient, or inferior to the modern European, while, in some respects, it is manifest they remain still unrivalled and peerless.

We are now able to comprehend and to appreciate the meaning of the significant scriptural phrase—"the wisdom of the Egyptians;" and the reason why Moses and the Grecian sages frequented their schools; and why, moreover, the latter spent so many years, not merely at one college, but oftentimes at different colleges, according to the objects which they had in view or the sciences to be acquired, before they deemed their education *finished*, or aspired to the honors of graduation. Thus, Lycurgus and Solon, the most eminent lawgivers among the Greeks, appear to have visited Egypt, chiefly to enlarge their acquaintance with the great principles of civil government and jurisprudence. The latter, as Plutarch informs us, received much useful instruction, on various important doctrines of philosophy and politics, from the priests at Sais. Thales and Eudoxus studied mathematics at Memphis. Pythagoras learned astronomy at Heliopolis. Thence he passed successively to the other most renowned seminaries; in which, for twenty-two years, he prosecuted his inquiries, at the feet and under the guidance of the learned Gamaliels of the day, with the most untiring patience, docility, perseverance and enthusiasm. After this pretty thorough novitiate in Egypt, and after travelling into Chaldæa, Persia and Phœnicia in quest of knowledge, he returned to his own native Samos—there to be persecuted by the same fell spirit of ignorance, envy, prejudice and bigotry, which, in a later and Christian age, haunted and embittered the existence of Roger Bacon and Galileo. Finally, he established a school of

his own at Crotona in Italy. And Plato too, the devoted disciple of Socrates during eight happy years, then a student of the Pythagorean philosophy in Magna Græcia, and of various sciences at other distinguished foreign schools, thought it necessary to attend the lectures of the Egyptian professors also, before he opened his own famous Academy at Athens. Verily, the Grecian scholars must have been sorry lads, or they could hardly have contrived to lounge away their entire youth and some ten or twenty years of mature manhood, among a set of dreamy pedagogues, who, agreeably to the vulgar faith, would have disgraced the *old field schools* of our own unparalleled Virginia! We, however, with these and many similar facts on record, should, in our extreme simplicity, be disposed to think it impossible for the most intrepid skepticism to deny to ancient Egypt the palm of pre-eminent wisdom and learning. Of such pupils as Moses and Plato, her universities may have well been proud. And from the works and reputation of the pupil we may still judge of the master.

And if we bear in mind, that even Plato and most of the other Greeks did not visit Egypt until after the Babylonian and Persian invasions, when only the wreck of her former science remained, we shall be able to make some equitable allowance for the fragmentary character of their reports, and for the seeming contradictions and even absurdities which we occasionally find in their writings.

O, quam te dicam bonam
Antehac fuisse, tales cum sint reliquæ?

But this paper must have an end. In preparing it, I have felt the difficulty of selection from the great mass of materials at hand, and especially of compressing within the limits of a readable article a small portion of the most prominent and pertinent facts which abound in ancient authors. These, if judiciously arranged and fairly interpreted, could scarcely fail to dissipate much of the prejudice, error and skepticism which prevail on this subject. I had designed to bring under review the arts and sciences actually known among the earliest postdiluvian nations; and to offer a few brief comments upon their literature, manners, customs, laws, religion and peculiar institutions. I had also marked a number of passages in sundry modern writers, with a view to point out the inconclusiveness of their reasoning, and its inconsistency oftentimes with the very

premises which they themselves admit. How much learned ingenuity, for example, has not been expended in attempts to depreciate or to get rid of the Egyptian claims to any respectable degree of proficiency in astronomy, mathematics, chemistry, metallurgy, physics, anatomy, navigation, geography, architecture, engraving, sculpture, painting, etc., merely because an arbitrary and inexorable theory seemed to demand a vastly longer time for such high attainments than any authentic history could furnish?

I conclude then with the remark, that if the Egyptians, Assyrians and Phœnicians never existed in a savage state; if their immediate progenitors, up to the age of Noah, were, like himself, civilized (and we proved, as we think, on a previous occasion, that man was created a civilized being, and thus continued down to the miraculous dispersion from Babel)—then it follows, that history cannot conduct us back to a period when the whole human race was savage; and consequently, that the philosophic and popular doctrine, that the *savage* was the original or primeval condition of mankind is indefensible;—that it is a mere gratuitous and baseless assumption;—and that the entire fabric, constructed by system-builders upon this foundation, is but a castle in the air, and can never withstand the artillery of reason, Scripture, and history.

As before we traced the stream of civilization, as it issued pure and bright from the primitive fountain in Eden, throughout the antediluvian world, to the fertile plains of Shinar; so now we can retrace it upwards till we arrive at the same point. The course is obvious, simple and direct. The civilization of modern Europe—of the Gauls, Germans, Britons, Goths, Vandals, Huns, Scandinavians, and the rest of the northern barbarians—was derived from the Romans; as theirs had been from the Greeks; and theirs again from the Egyptians and other Orientals. Prior to these latter nations, savage life is unknown to either sacred or profane history.

ARTICLE II.

BAPTISM :—THE INTERPRETATION OF ROM. 6 : 3, 4, AND COL. 2 : 12.

By Rev. Edward Beecher, President of Illinois College, Jacksonville, Illinois.

[Continued from Vol. V., page 48.]

§ 29. *Importance of a correct Interpretation of Rom. 6 : 3, 4, and Col. 2 : 12.*

THE conclusion to which we have arrived by our previous inquiries is this : *Purification* is enjoined by a specific command, but *no particular mode* of purification is enjoined. Of course, any individual may be lawfully purified in the way that he prefers. No result can be more desirable than this, for none tends more directly to harmonize the church. It combines the two fundamental requisites for union, which are, 1, to take from no church any thing which it desires as to its own mode of purification; and 2, to authorize each church to regard the purification of others, though differing from its own, as valid. Who, that loves the harmony of the church, who, that regards the feelings and wishes of Christ, would not rejoice at an issue so auspicious? What can be more desirable than a union without sacrifice of principle, or loss of any valued practice? But this result secures all this; nay, more, it would give to our Baptist brethren, not only the full enjoyment of all they desire without diminution or loss, but add to it the sweet persuasion, that, on this point, all their Christian brethren are also right, and can, in like manner, enjoy the mode which they prefer.

All painful barriers to communion will at once be taken down, the middle wall of partition will fall, and all, in Christ, will be united as one new man.

Proportion then to the desirableness of this event, is the necessity of a radical investigation and correct interpretation of Rom. 6 : 3, 4, and Col. 2 : 12; for, next to the word *βαπτίζω*, have been, and still are the most serious obstacles to such union. As I have before stated, our Baptist brethren regard these passages as an inspired exposition of the mode of baptism, as proving, irresistibly, that the rite is designed, not

merely to represent purification from sin, but purification in a way significant of the death, burial and resurrection of Christ, and of the death, burial and resurrection of the believer with him; and although this signification of the rite was not seen by men when it was first established, yet it was fully before the mind of God, and was finally and fully disclosed by the Apostle Paul. In this they are no doubt perfectly sincere, as they are also in the conviction that no mode of purification, devoid of this striking significance, is in accordance with the revealed will of God. Nor are they without authority for interpreting these texts as referring to the mode of the external rite. Indeed, the opinions of the Fathers, whatever they may be worth, so far as I have examined, are entirely with them. This explanation seems to have been adopted at a very early period. But it was most fully developed by Chrysostom; and undoubtedly his authority and eloquence, more than those of any other man, tended to give it currency in the East, whilst the influence of Augustine was equally decisive in the West. Besides, it is strongly sustained by the opinions of many modern critics. Of these, it is enough to mention Luther, Jaspis, Knapp, Rosenmüller, Doddridge and Barnes—none of them Baptists by profession.

Of course we need not wonder that our Baptist brethren feel strong, and express themselves with confidence, and even exultation, in speaking of these passages. Says Mr. Carson (Cox and Carson, p. 234), "I value the evidence of these passages so highly, that I look on them as perfectly decisive. They contain God's own explanation of his own ordinance. And in this, I call upon my unlearned brethren to admire the divine wisdom. They do not understand the original, and the adoption of the words *baptize* and *baptism* can teach them nothing. Translators, by adopting the Greek word, have contrived to hide the meaning from the unlearned. But the evidence of the passages in question cannot be hid, and it is obvious to the most unlearned. The Spirit of God has enabled them to judge for themselves in this matter. Whilst the learned are fighting about βαπτίζω and certain Greek prepositions, let the unlearned turn to Rom. 6: 4, and Col. 2: 12, etc." This may be taken as a fair specimen of the strength of feeling that pervades the whole body; and if so, it is plain that all hopes of union are fallacious, until the true interpretation of these passages is ascertained. Most cordially, therefore, do I

unite with Mr. Carson in inviting, not the unlearned only, but all—learned and unlearned—to turn to Rom. 6 : 3, 4, and Col. 2 : 12.

§ 30. *Points at issue—Principles of reasoning.*

Let us first present in full these remarkable and important passages of the word of God, and then endeavor to ascertain upon what points the interpretation of them turns. They are as follow : *Ἡ ἀγνοεῖτε, ὅτι ὅσοι ἐβαπτίσθημεν εἰς Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν εἰς τὸν θάνατον αὐτοῦ ἐβαπτίσθημεν ; Συνετάφημεν οὖν αὐτῷ διὰ τοῦ βαπτίσματος εἰς τὸν θάνατον· ἵνα ὥσπερ ἠγέρθη Χριστὸς ἐκ νεκρῶν διὰ τῆς δόξης τοῦ πατρὸς οὕτως καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐν καινότητι ζωῆς περιπατήσωμεν.* Rom. 6 : 3, 4. *Συνταφέντες αὐτῷ ἐν τῷ βαπτίσματι· ἐν ᾧ καὶ συνῆγέρθητε διὰ τῆς πίστεως τῆς ἐνεργείας τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ ἐγείραντος αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν.* Col. 2 : 12.

Upon these passages two distinct *questions* may be raised.

I. *Is the BAPTISM of the believer here spoken of external ?*

II. *Are the BURIAL and RESURRECTION of the believer here spoken of external ?*

I here assume the following positions or principles, the first of which has been already proved, and the second of which is so obviously true as to need no proof.

1. The philological question, as to the import of βαπτίζω, *neither depends upon the interpretation of this passage, nor is affected by it.* Each stands upon its own ground, and must be decided by its own evidence. And if it were proved that external baptism, burial and resurrection are here referred to, it would only prove, that, under a command to purify, they did in fact purify by immersion. And we must still translate the passage : “ We have been buried with him by *purification* into his death,”—not by “*immersion*” into his death. For we have already shown that, as a religious term, βαπτίζω does not mean to immerse, but solely to purify. In other words, we could prove immersion, &c. only by the word *bury*, and not at all by the word baptize.

2. *As the baptism is, so is the burial.* That is, if the baptism is external, so is the burial ; and if internal, so is the burial. We are buried by the baptism spoken of,—*Συνετάφημεν αὐτῷ διὰ τοῦ βαπτίσματος*, etc. Rom. 6 : 4. And an external baptism cannot produce an internal burial, nor can an internal baptism produce an external burial.

§ 31. *Position to be proved—Sources of evidence.*

We now proceed to consider the two questions above stated. In answering them, three positions have been taken:

1. The baptism into Christ is external, and of course the burial and resurrection.

2. The baptism is external, but the burial and resurrection are internal.

3. The baptism, burial, resurrection, etc. are all internal, and the passage does not refer to the external rite at all, nor derive any of its language from it; but the language would have been just as it is, if the rite had been administered by sprinkling alone, or even if there had been no external rite.

The third is the position which I intend to maintain; and it is obviously the direct antagonist of the first,—the usual position of the Baptists, and also of the Fathers and others. The second is an intermediate position, advocated by Wardlaw, Prof. Stuart and others, but, as I have indicated above, inconsistent with itself; because if the baptism is external so must be the burial and the resurrection. It is on this ground that Prof. Ripley reasons, and I think conclusively, against Prof. Stuart. "This opinion" (that the burial is internal), he says, "seems effectually opposed by the circumstance that the burying is performed by *baptism*, an *external rite*." p. 86. And all, who admit that the external rite is here spoken of, must, it seems to me, be inevitably driven to Prof. Ripley's ground. But, believing as I do that the external right is not meant, and that the external interpretation of this passage is not only false, but injurious to the cause of truth and holiness, I shall proceed to state the evidence which seems to me to overthrow the first position, and to establish the last. My leading arguments may be arranged under the four following heads:

1. Evidence from the logical exigencies of the passages, i. e. from the course of the argument.

2. Evidence from the *usus loquendi*, as to spiritual death, burial, resurrection, &c.

3. Evidence from the congruity of the interpretation with the general system of truth.

4. Evidence from the moral tendencies and effects of each interpretation.

§ 32. *Argument from the logical exigencies of Rom. 6: 3, 4.*

Let us then consider, 1, the course of the argument, and 2, the

logical exigencies of Rom. 6 : 3, 4. We shall consider Col. 2 : 12 by itself. The argument involves three points :

1. An objection stated in the form of a question, v. 1. "What then ? Shall we continue in sin that grace may abound ?" Does not the doctrine of the free forgiveness of the greatest sins, by the abounding grace of God through Christ, lead to this result ? Or, to put it in the form of a positive objection, the doctrine of the forgiveness of sins by free grace tends to relax the power of motives to holiness, and to encourage men to live in sin.

2. A reply, v. 2 : "God forbid. How shall we, who are dead to sin, live any longer therein ?" Here Paul speaks in the name of all who are really forgiven, and virtually asserts, that all, who are in fact forgiven, are of course dead to sin, and cannot live any longer therein. Implying, of necessity, that the system itself produces this effect on all who experience its true and genuine influence, and that this is necessary and universal. In brief, the objection is: Does not the system encourage men to sin ? The answer is: No, it makes them dead to sin, so that they cannot live any longer in it.

3. A proof that the fact alleged is true—i. e. that the system does tend to holiness, with immense power, and not to sin. vs. 3-11.

The question now at once arises, What is good and logical proof of such a point, i. e. of the true and natural operation of a moral system on the human mind ? In answering this, we shall perceive at once the logical exigencies of the passage.

Can such proof then be found in external rites, solemn promises, and significant symbols ? Or must we look for it in a clear statement of the internal, natural and inevitable operation of the system as a system on the mind ? As to the first, I need only ask, what system, be it good or bad, is destitute of significant rites and symbols, and of solemn professions and promises ? Papists and Protestants, Arminians, Calvinists, Unitarians, Campbellites, Mormonites—all have them : even the rite of immersion is common to some of the worst with some of the best. But in what case have these things given to any system a regenerating or sanctifying power sufficient to uproot and destroy the desperate depravity of the human heart ? Is it not a well known fact, that the radical effects of all systems depend, not on external rites and solemn promises, but on principles ? These are the internal

and germinating power of every system, and just so far as these are adapted to act on the human mind, so is the system. And as a general fact, those who depend most on promises, professions and external rites, as a means of subduing sin, have the least success.

In order then to make out a sound logical argument, it is necessary that Paul should exhibit the *internal* operation on the mind of the doctrine of the forgiveness of sins by faith, and prove that it does in fact cause all who come under its influence to be dead to sin. *This, according to the internal mode of interpretation, he does ; but, according to the external mode he does it not.* The one states the actual and inward effects of the forgiveness of sins through faith. The other merely refers us to the influence of an external rite. That this is so let us now proceed to establish.

The fundamental points in the interpretation are four :

1. *Ἐβαπτίσθημεν* is to be interpreted, *we have been purified or purged*, in the legal or sacrificial sense, to denote the actual purification, or purgation of the conscience from guilt by the Spirit. This is the spiritual baptism of the Holy Ghost, and the first actual influence of the system on the mind of a convicted sinner. Of this state of mind we have the following beautiful description from the pen of Watts :

Sweet was the time when first I felt
The Saviour's pardoning blood,
Applied to cleanse my soul from guilt,
And bring me home to God.

Thus, by this mode of translation, we pass at once, not to an external rite, but to the actual influence of the system on the mind.

2. *Ἐβαπτίσθημεν εἰς Χριστόν* is to be interpreted as indicating no external rite, but an actual union with Christ by this spiritual purgation, or sense of the forgiveness of sins. This consciousness of forgiving love awakens corresponding love, and produces an entire union to Christ and devotedness to him. "Whom not having seen ye love ; and in whom, though now ye see him not, yet believing, ye rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory." This is a spiritual baptism into Christ, involving a real and vital union to him.

3. As the baptism into Christ is thus internal and spiritual, so are the death, burial and resurrection spoken of as produced

by it ; and these are to be regarded as the genuine and universal effects of the system of forgiveness by faith in Christ.

4. These changes involve a crucifixion to sin, a death to it, a burial as it regards the old man, and a resurrection as it regards the new, analogous to the natural crucifixion, death, burial and resurrection of Christ. Thus the propositions of Paul may be briefly reduced to this : By forgiveness of sins we are truly and vitally united to Christ, and the inevitable effect of this union is to exterminate, radically and entirely, our old sinful character, and to produce a new one, pure and holy like his own. That these propositions, if true, do make a logical argument, none can deny. Thus,

Objection. The system of forgiveness of sins through faith in Christ tends to embolden men in sin.

Reply. It does not ; for all who are truly forgiven are dead to sin, and cannot live in it any longer. This is the natural and necessary consequence of the system.

Proof. All who are forgiven are united by it to Christ, and it is the inevitable consequence of this union to cause death unto sin and life unto God.

Now if the facts alleged are not only true, but obvious and well known, then the argument is not only logical, but one of the highest power. But need I attempt to show that they are so ? Look first at a spiritual baptism. See the convinced sinner, agonized by the scorpion stings of a guilty conscience and fears of coming wrath, and earnestly inquiring, What shall I do ? Next look at him baptized by the Holy Ghost, his conscience purged from guilt by the blood of Christ, his sins forgiven, his soul redeemed—an enemy, an alien, a rebel no more, but a child of God, a son, an heir. In the midst of all his joy, what one thought above all others will of necessity fill and overwhelm his mind ? It is this : *To the death of Christ I owe it all ; —Oh what had eternity been to me had it not been for the death of Christ !* And now what must be—what will be the inevitable course of his soul ? Can he endure the thought of living in sin any longer ? Speak, oh speak, ye who have ever felt the overwhelming, the infinite, the irresistible power of a Saviour's love. Was not its natural, its necessary tendency to produce an entire and vital union of the soul to Christ, and a ceaseless and intense desire to be formed in his perfect image, and under the power of his love to make efforts to exterminate every sin, of which not even the remotest idea had been formed

before ? Such an appeal to every possible principle of gratitude, honor, generosity, love, hope and fear, was never combined in the universe before ; nor is such a combination possible, save to an infinite, incarnate, atoning God. And what do facts say ? Need the oft repeated story of the Moravian brethren, and the poor Greenlanders be told again ? Need the experience of ages past, and of every faithful and successful minister of the present day be rehearsed in proof ? Nay, we all know the fact ; it lies on the very surface of the system, as well as in its lowest depths ; yea, I had almost said, it is its all in all.

What, therefore, the internal interpretation affirms as it regards the natural influence of the system of forgiveness by faith in Christ, is an obvious and well known truth ; and it is true concerning this system alone. The argument, then, is not only perfectly logical, but one of the highest importance and power.

But what shall we say of the external interpretation ? How does, or how can an external rite prove that the system of forgiveness of sins through Christ produces death to sin ? The reply of the Fathers would have been logical if true. They held that Christ gave to the water a purging power ; it was holy water ; there was a mysterious energy to destroy sin and to communicate the Holy Spirit.—Hence they urged sinners to come to the baptismal pool, very much as sinners are urged to come to the inquirer's seat, or even to Christ. Alas for the religion of Christ ! for centuries long and dark this was almost the only view of the church ; and let those, who attach such weight to patristic interpretation, weigh well, before they give it much authority, that malignant and damnable system—of which it was an essential part—BAPTISMAL REGENERATION ! What tongue can utter the delusion, the spiritual despotism and the misery, which have been poured from that full cup of wrath on a guilty world ! This view, therefore, is not only to be rejected as false, but to be abhorred as unutterably pernicious.

We come then to all that remains to the moral influence of the solemnity of the baptismal promise and rite, as exhibited by Prof. Chase and others ; or, to the argument from its import as stated by Mr. Carson. According to the first view, those who have been duly immersed are supposed to be thus addressed : “ Reflect how solemn your professions and promises in the hour of baptism, and how significant the rite by which your duty was shadowed forth, and your relations to Christ presented to the mind. Did you not solemnly promise, when immersed, to die

unto sin and to live unto God? And as you sunk into a watery grave, and came forth once more to the vital air, did you not solemnly show forth your duty to die to sin, and rise to a new and holy life, and also the death, burial and resurrection of Christ, by which your salvation was procured?"

It is painful indeed even to seem to speak severely of what is so sincerely and conscientiously said. But, in fidelity to God and to man, I am constrained to ask: What does all this amount to, unless it be to throw the main and peculiar reforming power of the gospel, upon the influence to be exerted by the solemnities of one external rite? And is it come to this? Is this all the answer that even an apostle can give to an objection against the gospel, so deep, so fundamental? Are solemn promises and the moral power of one rite, the vital and essential elements of the reforming power of the gospel? God forbid that I should deny or diminish their usefulness in their place. But this is not their place. We all know—universal experience has taught us—that promises, however solemn, and rites however significant, have no such reforming power. And universal observation has shown that those, who are baptized by the particular mode of immersion, are not by it made better Christians than others. On this point let Prof. Chase himself speak. "To you," he says, "I have intrusted the vindicating of my wisdom and goodness in the institution of baptism, by exemplifying in your lives *its holy tendency*. Vain are all other vindications without this." Sermon on the Design of Baptism, p. 28. But he says, p. 26, "Christians living in error on this subject, and attached, as men naturally are, to what has been handed down from their fathers, have marked us; and the men of the world have marked us. They have observed our lives. And have we never heard the keen reproach: What do ye more than others? Ah! my brethren, if it were only a slander, we could bear it. But when he himself—our Lord and Master—into whose death we have been baptized, casts on us the grieved and piercing look, which he cast on Peter when he had denied him, and asks: What do ye more than others? we can only go out and weep bitterly." Will my honored brother allow me to suggest, that, if he will place infinitely less dependence on the power of that external rite, in which he *differs* from other Christians, and infinitely more dependence on those great truths of the system, which he has in common with other Christians, and on which its reforming power is entirely based,

he will have reached the true and only secret of irresistibly moving moral appeals? Till then, unless all the laws of the human mind shall be changed, he will labor in vain to secure, by the aid of any external rite, the end which he so sincerely and ardently desires.

But Mr. Carson and others will say: That is not our view. We hold that Paul uses the symbolical import of baptism, to prove that believers are in fact dead to sin. To this I reply: It does not help the case; for an external rite, in such a course of argument, cannot prove any such thing. How can the operation of any system on the mind be proved, except by looking directly at the mind itself, and considering the effect of the system on it? To test the argument, let us suppose an objector, and see what Mr. Carson on his ground can reply.

Obj. I distrust this system of freely forgiving the greatest sins through faith in Christ. It tends to encourage men to live in sin.

Mr. C. Not at all. Those who live under it are of course dead to sin.

Obj. Pray how do you prove that?

Mr. C. Are you indeed so ignorant as not to know? Why it is clearly proved by the import of the baptismal rite.

Obj. Pray explain the nature of the proof?

Mr. C. It exhibits those baptized in a figure, as dead with Christ, and thus proves that they are so. See p. 231.

Obj. But how can an external exhibition of this sort prove that Christians are dead to sin?

Mr. C. Thus. This is not an accidental similitude, but a divinely appointed emblem; and, therefore, what it indicates God affirms, and, therefore, it must be true. See pp. 231, 232.

Obj. So then it amounts to this; it is so, because God declares it to be so by this rite?

Mr. C. Yes, this is its force.

Obj. Well then, if it were a case of mere authority and not of argument, it would be in point. But as a means of removing my difficulties by argument, it is not in point. For I am looking at a system of forgiveness of sins; and I affirm that it appears to me as if it would encourage, and not check sin. And you undertook to reason with me, and yet you explain nothing, and only silence me by mere authority. Can you not reason with me, and show from the system itself, and from the laws of the mind, that it does not so tend? Lay aside, I beseech you,

your external symbols, and look at the things themselves. Just show me the necessary operation of the system on the mind of a forgiven sinner.

What can Mr. Carson do but comply with his request? And this brings him at once to the true and internal mode of interpretation—to lay aside all external rites, and to bend all his energies to prove, by an appeal to the mind under the operation of the system, that it has a reforming, and not a demoralizing power. And this, as I have already shown, is precisely what Paul does, without the least allusion to an external rite.

The obvious fact is, that all allusion to an external rite is here out of place. It destroys the train of reasoning, perplexes and confuses the mind, and causes a deep and painful feeling of the entire absence of logical proof. Hence we need not wonder, that logical minds have felt this. Mr. Barnes says openly that there is no *reasoning* here, but mere popular appeal; and truly, according to the external mode of interpretation, there is none. But is this the place for popular appeal? If ever an objection deserved a thorough and logical reply, this is the one. Moreover, up to this point we have had reasoning, cogent and condensed. Why suppose a break in the chain here? Above all other places, this ought to be strictly logical, and unanswerably strong; and so indeed it is. There is no break; there is no flaw; there is no relying on popular appeal; there is no magnifying of the power of promises, professions and external rites. But there is a close logical and unanswerable argument, from the necessary operation of the gospel on the human mind. But this will become still more evident, when we proceed to consider the requisitions of the *usus loquendi*, as to spiritual crucifixion, death, burial, etc.

§. 33. *Argument from the usus loquendi as to spiritual death, burial, etc.*

We have great reason for gratitude, that the mode of speech, used in these disputed passages, is not limited to them, but exists in numerous other places, where it can be the subject of no fair dispute. The *usus loquendi* in question is not accidental, without rules, and obscure, but based on principles clear, certain and consistent. It is found chiefly in the writings of Paul, but it clearly occurs in those of Peter. Its principles are these:

1. The spiritual crucifixion, towards which the forgiveness of sins tends, as already shown, is a work involving great and intense pain, and to induce a man to summon all his resolu-

tion and energy to do it thoroughly, powerful motives are needed.

2. Such is the nature of man, that the most powerful motives, by which he can be influenced, must be derived from the following sources—(1,) affecting examples of fortitude in suffering—(2,) infinite blessings received through a suffering friend—(3,) the deep interest of that friend in our suffering for him. The loss of fortitude to endure suffering for the general good, and a love of indolence and ease are the universal characteristics of our depraved nature, and are the hardest of all to be overcome. But if the idea can be fully thrown into the mind and kept daily before it, that our highest benefactor himself *suffered with infinite fortitude*, and not only so, but that he thus suffered *for us*, and not only so, that he infinitely and ardently desires *to form the same traits in us*, and rejoices to see us, from love to him, crucify the spirit of indolence, indulgence and ease, and learn to rejoice in a life of fortitude and suffering for the good of others, like his own, then motives are concentrated, and accumulated, the power of which no man can resist.

3. It is the design of this mode of speech to combine all these varied motives in one condensed appeal. The mode adopted is this. Christ and the believer are represented as mutually interested in each other, and both as *suffering* for and with the other. The part in each, that suffers, is called by the same name—the flesh. But in the one case, it is external and material—the body of Christ. In the other, it is internal and spiritual—the body of sin, the old man. As each is spoken of as having a body, so each body is represented as composed of members; in the one case, external and material as before, in the other case, internal and spiritual, i. e. various and deep-rooted habits of sin to eradicate, by a process as painful as to cut off a right hand or foot, or to pluck out a right eye. Thus we have the body of sin, and its members, the old man and his members, which are the same as the flesh, with its affections and lusts.

All these then are spoken of as to be crucified, eradicated and destroyed; but as the work is excessively painful, and flesh and blood shrink from its thorough execution, the example of Christ, as enduring intense pain in his flesh, i. e. his body and members, in the agonies of crucifixion for us, is presented as an example for us to imitate, in our moral crucifixion for him. And we are adjured, in view of such an example, such love for us, and such deep present interest in us, to arm ourselves with the

same resolute purpose to suffer for him, in crucifying and destroying the flesh. This entire train of thought is fully set forth in 1 Pet. 4: 1: "Forasmuch then as Christ hath *suffered for us* in the flesh, arm yourselves likewise with the same mind (i. e. summon all your energy to suffer for him in the flesh); *for he that hath suffered in the flesh hath ceased from sin.*" In other words, he who hath crucified the flesh, with the affections and lusts thereof, hath ceased from sin. Only the internal sense is here possible; for crucifying the flesh, in this sense, does destroy sin; bodily suffering does not. The final result is then stated: "that he no longer should live the rest of his time in the flesh (i. e. in the body, or in this world), to the lusts of man, but to the will of God." Here then we have the work to be done—to crucify the flesh, and the example of Christ in suffering, the fact that it was for us that he suffered, and his earnest desire that we should indicate the same fortitude in suffering for him, in order to become holy, and live in this world for God, and not for man. Thus the appeal is thorough and complete. And how great its power! Christian, are you relaxing your efforts to subdue sin? Do you say, It is too painful, I cannot endure it? But Oh, think again. Did Christ, your Saviour, suffer so much that you may be forgiven, and be restored to holiness, and does he earnestly desire it? has he fixed his heart upon it? is he deeply grieved at your negligence and sloth? Will you not then arouse yourself at once? Think of the fortitude and firmness with which he armed himself when he suffered for you; and arm yourself with the same mind to suffer for him, in becoming holy, which he manifested in suffering that you might become holy.

This mode of speech is carried out in other parts of Scripture, in great minuteness of detail, but always on this principle, that the sufferings of Christ are supposed to be fully before the mind, as an object of daily meditation and imitation, and that, whatever took place naturally in connection with the sufferings of Christ, has something to correspond with it spiritually, in its connexion with the sufferings of believers. Thus:

CHRIST.

THE BELIEVER.

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1. Christ suffered naturally. | 1. The believer suffers spiritually. |
| 2. Christ in his flesh, i. e. body natural. | 2. The believer in his flesh, i. e. body of sin. |

- | | |
|--|--|
| <p>3. The members of Christ's body were crucified.</p> <p>4. Christ's body died entirely. All natural life was totally extinct.</p> <p>5. Christ's natural death was for sin.</p> <p>6. Christ was buried naturally, and became invisible in the grave.</p> <p>7. Christ rose naturally, and appeared in new external glory.</p> <p>8. It was the mighty natural power of God that raised Christ.</p> <p>9. Christ after his resurrection sat down in heavenly places, bodily.</p> <p>10. Christ dies naturally no more; death hath no more dominion over him.</p> | <p>3. The members of the body of sin are to be crucified.</p> <p>4. The body of sin, the old man, the flesh, is to be entirely destroyed.</p> <p>5. The believer's spiritual death is to sin.</p> <p>6. The believer is to be buried spiritually and to become invisible in his old character.</p> <p>7. The believer is to rise spiritually and appear in a new, holy, glorious, spiritual character.</p> <p>8. It is the mighty power of God <i>through faith</i> that raises the believer.</p> <p>9. Believers sit down <i>by faith</i> in heavenly places, after their resurrection.</p> <p>10. Believers die in sin no more; death spiritual hath no more dominion over them.</p> |
|--|--|

This process is sometimes stated antithetically, and in separate parts, but it is also expressed in abbreviated forms of speech formed by compounding the word denoting the action with *σύν*, e. g. *συνπάσχω*, *συσταυρόω*, *συναποθνήσκω*, *συζωοποιέω*, *συνεγείρω*, *συνκαθίζω*, etc.; in all which cases is implied, I do or suffer that spiritually which Christ did or suffered naturally. So believers are said to suffer, be crucified, die, be buried, be restored to life, be raised, sit in heavenly places, and live forever *with Christ*, i. e. spiritually, as in his case naturally.

The reason of this is to be found in two facts.

1. Christ suffered, died, etc. naturally, in order to secure, not only forgiveness, but also these very spiritual changes in us, and it is the power of his example and love which in fact produces them. As Christ, therefore, had all these things in view, when he suffered, and as his sufferings rendered them sure, the spiritual sufferings of believers are looked on as virtually included in

the natural sufferings of Christ: their death *to sin* in his *for* it—their spiritual burial, resurrection and eternal life, in his natural burial, resurrection and eternal life. For surely one series did involve and render certain the other; and so when one came to pass actually, the other did virtually.

2. The ardent love to Christ, which ever glowed in the breast of Paul, led him to devise this mode of speech, as the best adapted to express his unutterable affection for his Saviour, his all-absorbing admiration of his character, and his infinite and intense desire to be in all things one with him. Hence, as the sufferings of his own adored Lord and Saviour passed every hour before his mind, an intense desire arose, as it were, to make them his own, that is, to identify himself with him, in absolute and perfect sympathy, and, especially, to admire and adore and imitate his character in that humiliation, and those sufferings which he underwent for us. But before he could thus perfectly sympathize with Christ, he must of course renounce and crucify entirely all former ambitions, selfish and worldly modes of feeling; for he could not perfectly sympathize with such suffering love, till he was perfectly like him. Hence, the least remains of sin he regarded as excluding him from a perfect experimental and sympathetic knowledge of the character of Christ; and, by self-crucifixion, to reach this point of a perfect experimental sympathy in the absolute perfection of a suffering Saviour, was the summit of all his desires. Hear him as he exclaims: "I count all things loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Jesus Christ, my Lord, that I may know him and the power of his resurrection, and the fellowship of his sufferings, being made conformable unto his death." And again: "I am crucified with Christ; nevertheless I live, yet not I, but Christ liveth in me." And again: "God forbid that I should glory, save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom the world is crucified unto me, and I unto the world."—The various forms of this mode of speech, in all its range, are not the mere offspring of a luxuriant poetic imagination. Nor are they merely the intellectual play of a fancy, that delights to trace analogies, and amuse with alliterations. They are the sacred, elevated spiritual language of unalterable love, the full power and beauty of which no eye can see, or heart feel, that has never felt the emotions from which it sprang. Without them, it may seem like a mere heartless play of the imagination; with them, it will at once be recognized as the spontaneous,

irresistible gushing forth of the emotions of a heart, every impulse of which is towards Christ, every desire of which is to be like him in all things, and one with him in joys and sorrows, in life and death. And sad was that day for the primitive church, when her heart ceased to beat responsive to that of Paul, and darkness fell upon the deep spiritual import of his sacred words. Then, in a fatal hour, the mystery of iniquity began to work ; and soon, regeneration, by an external form, and mystic, hidden influences, usurped the place of the real crucifixion of the body of sin.

To illustrate these principles, by quotations in detail, would exceed my limits. I shall only refer to the following passages of Scripture, on which they are based, and which, in order to see the whole truth on the subject, ought to be carefully examined.

In Eph. 1: 19—23, and 2: 1—7, natural death, resurrection, etc. in Christ are viewed analogically with death and sin, resurrection from sin, etc. in believers ; and the power of God, raising Christians by faith, is compared to his natural power in raising Christ, and said to be analogical to it ; and the idea that believers are restored to life, rise and sit down spiritually in heaven, as Christ did naturally, and that these changes in him involved theirs, is expressed by *συνεζωπονήσας συνήγειρε, συνεκάθισε*. In Phil. 3: 10—21, Paul desires to know fully, and in a spiritual sense,—that which corresponds by analogy to these natural changes in Christ,—1, sufferings ; 2, death ; 3, resurrection ; 4, experience of divine power ; and he shows how he aimed at the spiritual perfection, involved in a perfect similitude to the natural events—(i. e. a perfect moral crucifixion, death and resurrection)—though he had not yet attained, and was not yet perfect. There is not the least allusion to his own *natural resurrection* here. That would take place of course, and without any effort on his part, and the law of analogy totally forbids such an interpretation. In Col. 2: 20, and 3: 1—4, we have 1, *death* to the world with Christ ; 2, *a resurrection* with Christ, and a sympathy with the things where Christ is, producing an internal and hidden life in him. Both of these changes in the believer are internal and spiritual, and in Christ external.

See also Gal. 6: 14, 1 Pet. 4: 1, 2, Gal. 2: 19, 20, Col. 3: 5—14, Gal. 5: 24. To these add Rom. 6: 1—13 and Col. 2: 11—13. Some of these have been referred to before ;

and the last two contain the passages in dispute; but I refer to them now in order to present the Scripture evidence in a single group. One thing more deserves our notice in this place. Two spiritual states are sometimes used as analogical to the death of Christ,—one *death in sin*, as in Eph. 2: 1—7, and Col. 2: 11—13, the other *death to sin* by moral crucifixion, as in Rom. 6: 1—13 and Phil. 3: 10—21. But in no case is the fundamental law of the analogy disregarded, i. e. that the states or changes in believers are spiritual and internal, those of Christ natural and external. In the sense of death in sin, moreover, they are never said to be dead *with Christ*; for, to secure such a death in them, he did not aim; but their death in sin is merely spoken of as calling for the exercise of the mighty power of God to raise them up, just as Christ's natural death demanded almighty natural power in order to raise him up.

The inferences which I draw from this exhibition of the *usus loquendi* are these:

1. The general law of analogy demands the internal sense throughout the whole of Rom. 6: 1—13, and Col. 2: 11—13. Look at the preceding columns of parallel analogies. Of these all but 6 and 7 are undeniably internal and spiritual on one side, and external and natural on the other. By what law can 8 out of 10, in a connected series, be internal and spiritual, and the other two external and physical?

2. Of these two, one—resurrection—is clearly proved, in the analogous passages, to be used in a spiritual sense. See Eph. 2: 5, 6, and Col. 3: 1. Does not the *usus loquendi* then demand that sense here?

3. The resurrection in Col. 2: 11—13 is proved, by internal evidence, to be spiritual; for it is *by faith*. Compare this now with precisely the same idea in Eph. 1: 18—20, and 2: 4—6, Phil. 3: 10, 11, Col. 1: 3; and who can doubt? So in keeping believers, God exercises his mighty power *through faith*, 1 Pet. 1: 5: Ἐν δυνάμει Θεοῦ ποιοῦμενοι διὰ πίστεως, εἰς σωτηρίαν. So in Col. συνηγέρθητε διὰ τῆς πίστεως τῆς ἐνεργείας τοῦ Θεοῦ denotes: “ye were raised with him, by that faith, through which the power of God exerts itself.” Of course, if the resurrection is spiritual, so is the burial.

4. In the phrase, θάνατον αὐτοῦ, in Rom. 6: 3, the law of analogy requires αὐτοῦ to be regarded as the genitive of similitude, i. e. a death like his, or analogical to it. This use of the

genitive is exceedingly common; as in Jude 11, the way of Cain, the error of Balaam and the gainsaying of Core mean a way, error and gainsaying, like that of Cain, Balaam and Core. So in Luke 11: 29, the sign of Jonas, the prophet, is a sign like that of Jonas the prophet; for in fact it was the burial of Christ three days and nights. But to put it beyond all doubt, in v. 5 it is expressed in full—*τῷ ὁμοιωματι τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ*—"the likeness of his death," i. e. a spiritual death, like his natural death.

5. Finally, the *usus loquendi*, as it regards both spiritual baptism, and spiritual crucifixion and death, authorizes and requires us thus to interpret Rom. 6: 3, 4, and Col. 2: 12.

Know ye not that so many of us, as have been purified into Christ, i. e. truly united to Christ by the forgiveness of sins, have been, by the forgiveness of sins, subjected to a spiritual death, like his natural death? Therefore as he was naturally buried, so are we spiritually buried by that forgiveness of sins, which subjected us to a spiritual death. That, like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life. Rom. 6: 3, 4. As he was buried naturally, so were ye spiritually buried in the forgiveness of your sins, in which ye also rose spiritually as he did naturally, by that faith through which is exerted the power of that God, who raised him from the dead. Col. 2: 12. From the whole context, nothing can be more certain than the spiritual sense of this passage. We have, in v. 11, internal circumcision, and putting off the body of the flesh; in v. 12, a resurrection by faith; in v. 13, an internal death in sin and an internal restoration to life. Who then can have the least ground for calling the burial an external burial? So Rom. 6: 6. Paul expressly states that all that he has said of the death of the believer is to be understood of the death of the old man, and the destruction of the body of sin. But of course the burial and resurrection are as the death.

§ 34. *Argument from the congruity of the interpretation with the general system of truth.*

The system of truth is but one. Hence all truth is consistent with itself; and the more we investigate its minute relations, the more are we impressed with a conviction of its universal harmony. It is this perception of congruity in ten thousand minute particulars, which produces what we call a sense or feeling of verisimilitude. And as the operations of the mind are of-

ten so rapid as to elude analysis, it gives rise to what may be called a presentiment of truth, even before investigation. Nor is this to be despised. In any mind familiar with the great outlines of truth, such rapid perceptions of the agreement or disagreement of a given view with those great outlines have a real and logical basis, as investigation seldom fails to show. But when investigation has taken place, they can be stated and exhibited in their true relations. Some of the incongruities of the external system of interpretation with the existing system of truth, I shall proceed to state.

1. It is incongruous to take so much notice of one external institution, and to say nothing of the rest.

2. It is incongruous, if only one is taken, to notice one which is less adapted to exert a great moral influence, and not to notice one more adapted.

3. It is incongruous for Paul to make so much of any external rite and especially of this.

4. It is still more incongruous for Jesus Christ to do the same.

5. It is incongruous to establish one institution to commemorate the death of Christ, and then intrude on its province by another, established for a different end.

As has been stated, the external interpretation rests the reforming power of the gospel, in a great degree, on the influence of professions and promises connected with an external rite, or, on its influence in presenting truth to the mind. And are there no other institutions that have the same external power? Are there no solemn vows around the Lord's table, and no intensely affecting truths as to the death of Christ, inculcated by it? Does the Sabbath declare nothing of a heavenly rest, nor bid man to die to the world? Has the ministry and the preached word no reforming power? Why say so much of the "holy tendency" of immersion and omit all these?

But if any one of these was to be selected, why choose that one which occurs but once in the life of a believer, and omit the oft-recurring influence of the Lord's supper, and the solemn promises, renewed with increasing fervency, from year to year, till death closes the scene? Why say so much of the weaker, and yet wholly omit the stronger moral power? Is there indeed in this one rite a secret mystic influence, as the fathers thought, operating with immense power, breaking down and destroying all sin, actual and original, at one blow? If not, and if it stands solely on the ground of moral influence, in im-

pressing truth by symbols on the mind, then the selection of this and the omission of the Lord's supper are truly incongruous.

But if we could expect such an effort to magnify an external rite from any one, we should least of all expect it from Paul, who regarded it, in comparison with the gospel, as of so little weight that he thanked God that he baptized none of the Corinthians, but Crispus and Gaius and the household of Stephanus, and affirmed that God sent him not to baptize but to preach the gospel, and who gloried in nothing save in the cross of Christ. Is it possible that this same Paul has, in another place, attempted to refute a fundamental objection to this same gospel, by magnifying the influence of this same external rite? What! at one time ascribe to it in some way such prodigious power to eradicate sin, and then thank God that he did not administer it, and declare that he was not sent to do it!

Turn now to Christ, and hear him (Matt. 12: 7) rebuke the rigid construers of external observances by the reproof: "If ye had known what that meaneth, *I will have mercy and not sacrifice*, ye would not have condemned the guiltless." Again, when Peter desired a more complete washing than the rest of the disciples (John 13: 10) hear him declare that, to indicate complete purification, a washing of the feet is enough. And can we believe that this same Jesus inspired his beloved Paul to declare that purification cannot be acceptably signified in more than one way, and that one immersion of the whole body?

Finally, the Lord's supper was established to show forth the Lord's atoning death until he should come. Baptism indicates the actual purgation of the heart and conscience from sin, when the atonement is applied by the Holy Spirit. One indicates how redemption was procured; the other how it is applied. One commemorates atonement by Christ; the other regeneration by the Holy Spirit. But the external interpretation makes baptism a commemoration of three things—1, the natural death and resurrection of Christ; 2, the spiritual death and resurrection of the believer, and 3, the natural resurrection of the believer. Carson, p. 232. This is incongruous indeed. It is a manifest intrusion into the province of the Lord's supper, and that without the least reason; and it nearly loses in ideas of death and resurrection, all reference to purity. In truth, it seems to immerse and almost to bury out of sight the main idea of the rite, and to bring vividly before the mind the fundamental ideas of another rite; so much so, that, in reading Prof.

Chase's sermon on the design of baptism, one can hardly avoid feeling that it is even more a discourse on the design of the Lord's supper than a discourse on the design of that rite, which was peculiarly ordained to show forth the work of the Holy Ghost. Moreover, so far as it relates to purity, it is not the direct figure of the reality, but only the figure of a figure of the reality. *Purification* is the reality. But immersion, the Baptists all affirm, is the figure of *death*. But death is only a figure of the spiritual destruction of the old man, in which purification actually consists. But of purification it is no figure.

Such then are the inconsistencies and incongruities, which attend all efforts to force an external sense on the baptism and burial spoken of in these passages. But assign to them the internal and spiritual sense, and all is consistent and clear. For it rests the reforming power of the gospel on no external rite, and intrudes on none. Nor does it at all disagree with the known character and feelings of Christ or of Paul, but perfectly agrees with both; for it directs us at once to the internal power of a spiritual purgation of the soul by the Holy Ghost to unite to Christ, and thus to destroy the body of sin. And it presents distinctly and fully to the mind that in which Paul was wont most to glory—the cross of Christ—and the energy of the gospel as the power of God to salvation to every one that believeth.

§ 35. *Argument from the moral tendencies and effects of each mode of interpretation.*

The principles of this argument are plain. They are these. All truth, in its permanent influences, tends to holiness; all error, to sin. Therefore, if we can show, *a priori*, a tendency to sin in any view, or prove by an appeal to facts that it has resulted in sin, we are authorized to draw the conclusion that the view is false. Nevertheless, in this mode of reasoning great care is needed not to confound mere accidental sequences with real and genuine effects. To guard against this, note the following facts:

1. Self-crucifixion is of all things most painful. From all suffering men naturally shrink; but much more from the internal pain and humiliation attendant on subduing sin, than from any other. Hence to spare the old man, pilgrimages, fastings, flagellations, bodily sufferings of all kinds and even death itself are willingly endured.

2. Hence in all ages a universal propensity to avoid the real

and internal crucifixion of the old man, by a reliance on external forms of mysterious operation, or on an authorized ministry, or a primitive church, or solemn ceremonies, rather than on the simple and sure crucifixion of the flesh with the affections and lusts thereof.

3. The most powerful system, by which the devil ever corrupted and destroyed the gospel of Christ, even the great mystery of iniquity, has its foundation on a skilful use of this tendency of the human heart. It is a system expressly designed to exclude spiritual crucifixion, that is, to exclude real holiness, and to replace it by a religion of ceremonies and forms.

4. The external interpretation tends naturally to that very view, for its obvious sense is to make external baptism the great destroyer of sin, and the great defence of the church against it.

5. By the fathers, and even by Augustine, it was practically so regarded. He did not indeed exclude the Holy Spirit, but regarded the water, when consecrated, as involving, in some mysterious way, his presence; and though he threw out cautions against the grosser forms of baptismal regeneration, yet the practical influence of his urgent appeals to sinners to come to the baptismal pool, and wash away all their sins, or bury the old man, etc. etc., could not possibly have but one result. Baptism became practically the great thing; and on it, eternal life or eternal death seemed to hang. And in all this mournful process, the external interpretation of these texts is almost the great moving power of the whole. It is not wise to give to any one cause exclusive power in forming the papal system, but I hesitate not to say, that no one cause did more than *baptismal regeneration*; and no one cause did more to develop and mature that doctrine, than the external interpretation of these texts. Of this fact, pages of proof are at hand, and, if any one desires, can easily be produced. But to those who have examined enough to judge, no proof, I think, can be needed.

6. No modern corrections or limitations of the patristic interpretation of these passages have been able to neutralize, or destroy the injurious tendency of the external view; nor can it be done, so long as the great fact remains, that in an argument designed unanswerably to prove the sanctifying power of the gospel, an external rite comes where the internal energy of truth and the Holy Spirit ought to come. The external rite, if admitted at all with such a view, wrests and distorts the great

outlines of the whole picture. It is not the glorious gospel that fills the mind, as held by all real Christians, but the peculiar solemnity, fitness and significance of the form of immersion, or else the solemn promises made when immersed. And on a mind averse to self-crucifixion, and tending to self-complacency and censoriousness, what must be the moral effect of such appeals as these: "Yes, my brethren, we have been truly baptized. We have been *immersed*, and now the world looks to us for a proof of its sanctifying power?" Let it be granted that these things are not always said in pride, but often in deep and humble sincerity. But what art can extract the venom they are adapted to infuse, or prevent the inevitable tendency to magnify certain forms, and to freeze the heart of Christian love to all who are without the range of those forms? In multitudes of noble spirits, I rejoice to record it, the last effect is not produced. But it is to be ascribed to other and powerful counteracting causes, whilst, where no such counteracting causes exist, the venom rages unchecked; and we are not obscurely told that it is at least uncertain whether a person unimmersed can ever enter the kingdom of God, and immersion, as of old, practically usurps the place of regeneration. Among the evangelical Baptists this, indeed, is not true; other causes prevent. But there have long been others who equal or even exceed them in their zeal for immersion, and the Mormonites are now to be added to the list. If there is a real sanctifying power in this view, why are such multitudes of men, in all parts of our land, so zealous for it, who yet give no signs of crucifying the flesh with the affections and lusts thereof? The fact cannot be denied. Why is it so? Is it not because it presents, *as a cross to be taken up, a mere external rite*, and promises, in some way, by the mysterious operation of a form, to enable them to escape the self-crucifixion they so much dread? And can holy men—men of prayer—sustain that very mode of interpretation on which it all rests, and not, whether they will or no, confirm such men in their views? Let all who are truly holy cut loose from this view, and soon the unholy will sink it by their own moral gravitation, and it will disappear.

On the other hand, the internal interpretation directs the attention of Christians directly to the interior, central and fundamental work of self-crucifixion, under the influence of forgiving love, and declares that true and real forgiveness of sins always indicates itself, by the destruction of the flesh with the affections

and lusts thereof, and it stimulates and aids Christians, in the highest degree, by example and gratitude and sympathy between the believer and Christ.

It is no small loss then to the Christian world, not only to lose the whole power of these passages for good, but even to have them perverted for evil, or else so obscured in the smoke of controversy, that they produce almost no effect, except to awaken in the mind an anxiety to know whether they do mean immersion or not. Let them be redeemed from all perversion and controversy, and let them utter, in clear tones, the full heart of Paul, and they will arouse the whole church to the earnest pursuit of eminent holiness as with a trumpet call.

§ 36. *Objection from authority considered.*

The influence of authority, with many minds, is great; and I should not be surprised if some should try to urge the *argumentum ad verecundiam*, in view of opinions so numerous and respectable against this result.

To this with all deference I would make the following reply:

1. In a radical discussion of the question, *Are the majority right?* an appeal to names is totally illogical. This is manifestly a case of the kind.

2. In some cases, numbers are a presumptive argument of error, and not of truth; i. e. in the case of old errors long established, and never thoroughly reinvestigated.

3. That this is a case of the kind, one striking proof will clearly show, that in every argument for the external sense, which I have found after extended search, has rested entirely on an obvious, yet fundamental *petitio principii*. I refer to the fact that in every case it has been assumed, without proof or even an effort at proof, that the baptism spoken of is external,—just as if there were no such idea, in the word of God, as internal baptism, or as if it were of no importance, and, therefore, it is always *a priori* probable that whenever the word is used, the external rite is meant,—so probable that it may always be assumed without proof. Look now at the works of Prof. Chase, Mr. Carson and Prof. Ripley, so often alluded to, and you find not even an effort to prove, philologically, that the baptism is external. It is always assumed. And yet, as all know, this is a fundamental point in the whole discussion.

What then are the facts as they present themselves in the New Testament? They are these:

1. There is a baptism, infinitely more important than the external baptism, and of which the external baptism is but a sign.

2. In the spiritual baptism, a believer is actually purged from sin and guilt by the Holy Ghost. In the external, the forgiveness of sins is openly announced, on the assumption that he has repented and believes, as he professes.

3. The person baptized is regarded as calling on the name of the Lord for forgiveness, and the baptizer as announcing his forgiveness in the name of the Lord. Acts 22 : 16.

4. In the case of internal baptism, there is no such external use of the name of God, but a real forgiveness resulting in actual union to Christ. Hence,

5. The form—*βαπτίζεσθαι εἰς ὄνομα Χριστοῦ*—is adapted to express the external baptism ; *βαπτίζεσθαι εἰς Χριστόν*, to express the internal baptism, that actually unites to Christ.

6. To this view, all facts accord. For in every instance where *ὄνομα* is used, there is internal evidence in the passage to prove that external baptism is meant. Matt. 28 : 19, Acts 2 : 38, Acts 8 : 16, Acts 10 : 48, Acts 19 : 5, Acts 22 : 16, 1 Cor. 1 : 13, 15.

But in every case where *ὄνομα* is omitted, and *εἰς* precedes *Χριστόν* or *σῶμα*, denoting the spiritual body of Christ, there is internal evidence that external baptism is not meant, and that internal is meant. Rom. 6 : 3, 1 Cor. 12 : 13, Gal. 3 : 27. In case of the first two, we have exhibited the evidence of the internal sense in the preceding argument, and in § 11. In Gal. 3 : 27, the sense of *putting on Christ* is fixed by Rom. 13 : 14, as denoting, not an external profession of religion, but a real assumption of a holy character, like that of Christ. See also Eph. 4 : 24 and Col. 3 : 10, 12, for a perfect demonstration of this sense. Besides, it is utterly unworthy of Paul to say : “ As many of you, as have been externally baptized into Christ, have made a profession of religion,” but entirely worthy of him to say : “ As many, as have been baptized into Christ spiritually, have really been by it changed into his image ;” and this is true of all who have been spiritually baptized, but of all who have been externally baptized it is not true ; yet Paul affirms it of all ; *ὅσοι ἐβαπτίσθησαν εἰς Χριστόν*.

In 1 Cor. 10 : 2, *εἰς τὸν Μωϋσῆν ἐβαπτίσαντο* denotes neither Christian baptism nor external baptism ; but a throwing back the name of the antitype upon the type, from a regard to similar effects. Believers, by spiritual baptism are delivered from

Satan and united to Christ. The children of Israel were delivered from Pharaoh, and really united to Moses, as a leader and saviour, by the cloud and the sea. There was here *no external profession, but a real union to Moses* as a leader, effected by a separation and deliverance from Pharaoh. In all this, Moses was a type of Christ, and, therefore, the name of the antitype is thrown back upon this transaction, and it is called a baptism into Moses, but not into the name of Moses. On the same principle, i. e., regard to effects, spiritual baptism is called the antitype of the salvation of Noah and his family in the ark. For as one actually saved Noah in the ark, so the other actually saves believers in Christ.

If these facts are so, where is the *a priori* improbability that internal baptism is meant in Rom. 6: 3, which all advocates of the external sense have assumed? The fact is that the improbability, from the very form of language, is altogether against external baptism; and all, who assume it, not only do so without proof, but without the possibility of proof, and against clear proof to the contrary.

No more striking instance can be given of the influence of a technical and external use of a word, without any reference to its spiritual signification, to turn away the mind from the true sense of the word of God. For in Eph. 4: 5, 6, as well as in Rom. 6: 3 and 1 Cor. 12: 13 and Gal. 3: 27, the same cause has entirely hid the true and spiritual sense, and put an external rite where the whole context demands the work of the Holy Spirit. One Lord,—even Jesus Christ who made atonement,—one faith, or glorious system of truth to be believed, and one regeneration,—the glorious result of the application of that truth by the Holy Spirit! How incongruous to place an external rite into such relations, and, especially, so to exalt *external baptism*, and to say nothing of the Lord's supper!

Through the same external, formal habit of mind, the beautiful and spiritual sense of Eph. 5: 26 has been lost, though the washing is expressly declared to be by the word of God—*ἐν ῥήματι*; and the spiritual sense of *ἵδωρ* is overlooked, though God has expressly used it as a symbol of truth. I will sprinkle *clean water* on you, and ye shall be clean.

So also the spiritual sense of Titus 3: 5 is drowned beneath the flood of external baptismal regeneration, though the language is exactly adapted to express the beginning and progress of spiritual life, or regeneration and sanctification—*λουτῶν*

παλιγγενεσίας denoting the first, and ἀνακαινώσις πνεύματος ἁγίου the progressive sanctification, caused by abundant effusions of the Holy Spirit.

Finally, not only is it true that external baptism is not meant in Rom. 6: 3, 4 and Col. 2: 12, but it is also true that there is no reason to think that any part of the language is taken from that rite. For,

1. Even had there been no external rite, but internal baptism only, the force of the analogy would have called for the use of burial in both of these passages. In speaking of the spiritual crucifixion, death and resurrection of the believer, how could Paul help inserting burial?

2. The real origin of the language is obvious. *Christ was buried in fact*, as well as crucified, and the same series of events, that furnished to Paul all the rest of his ideas, would naturally furnish this.

3. The genius and habits of Paul's mind demand this origin; for it was not external baptism that was daily before his mind, but the death, burial and resurrection of Christ.

4. The supposed connection or similitude between the word βαπτίζω and burial does not exist; for βαπτίζω means to purify, and, therefore, would not suggest the idea of burial. Such, then, is the proof of the position originally stated, that the *baptism, burial, resurrection*, etc., spoken of in Rom. 6: 3, 4 and Col. 2: 12 are all *internal*, and that the passage does not refer to the external rite at all, nor derive any of its language from it; but that the language would have been just as it is, if the rite had been administered by sprinkling alone, or even if there had been no external rite whatever.

§ 37. *Apostolic practice considered.*

After what has been said, but few words are needed on this point. It is plain,

1. That to us it is of very little consequence, what their practice was; for the command was only to purify, and God attaches no importance to any one mode more than another.

2. It is not possible decisively to prove the mode used by the apostles; for if going to rivers, going down to the water and up from it, etc., create a presumption in favor of immersion, so does the baptism of three thousand on the day of Pentecost, in a city where water was scarce, and of the jailer in a prison, create a presumption in favor of sprinkling.

And if a possibility of immersion can be shown in the latter

cases, so can a possibility of sprinkling or pouring be shown in the former.

3. The command being to purify, and the facts being as stated, the decided probability is that both modes were used, and Christian liberty everywhere enjoyed.

4. A tendency to formalism led to a misinterpretation of Paul in Rom. 6: 3, 4 and Col. 2: 12; and this gave the ascendancy to immersion, which increased, as before stated, till it became general, though it was not insisted on as absolutely essential on philological grounds.

5. Various causes, even in the Roman Catholic church, at length produced a relaxation of this excessive rigor of practice. And most Protestants, at the Reformation, took the same ground. But,

6. A mistake in philology, after the Reformation, introduced a practice stricter and more severe than even that of the Fathers, and which reprobates Christian liberty on this subject, as a corruption of the word of God; because various causes induced even the Roman Catholic church to relax a little of the excessive strictness of antiquity. I know that all that comes from the Roman Catholic church is *a priori* suspicious. But bad as that church is, no one can deny that there is some truth there. The view I have advanced I hold, not on her authority, but on its own merits. And I will not reject or deny *a truth*, even if it is found in a corrupt church.

§ 38. *Final Result.*

It appears, then, that the whole subject turns on three points: 1; the import of βαπτίζω; 2, the significance of the rite; 3, early practice. On each, the argument in favor of immersion rests on a *petitio principii*. 1. It is assumed as improbable that βαπτίζω can mean *purify*, without respect to mode, if it also means, in other cases, *immerse*. The falsehood of this assumption has been shown, the existence of an opposite probability proved, and the meaning *purify* clearly established by facts. 2. The improbability of *internal* baptism in Rom. 6: 3, 4 and Col. 2: 12, has been assumed, and external baptism has also been assumed without proof. It has been shown that the external sense, and not the internal sense, is improbable, and that against the external sense there is decisive proof. It has also been assumed that the practice of the Fathers and others is proof of their philology, and that, therefore, they must have re-

garded the command to baptize as a command to immerse. The falsehood of this assumption has also been clearly shown. The result of the whole is, that as to the *mode of purification* we may enjoy Christian liberty; and that immeasurable evils attend the operation of those principles, by which many are now endeavoring to bring the church upon exclusive ground. There is no objection to immersion, *merely as one mode of purification*, to all who desire it. But to immersion as the *divinely ordained and only mode*, there are objections, deep and radical. We cannot produce unity by sanctioning a false principle; our Baptist brethren can, by coming to the ground of Christian liberty. The conclusion, then, to which I would kindly, humbly, affectionately, yet decidedly come is this: "Stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage."

The argument is now closed. I intend only to add a few words of a practical kind, as it relates to the translation of the Bible, the unity of the church, and Christian communion.

ARTICLE III.

THE STUDY OF THE CLASSICS AS AN INTELLECTUAL DISCIPLINE.

By E. D. Sanborn, Prof. of the Latin Lang. and Lit., Dartmouth College, N. H.

"HE who calls departed ages back again into being," says Niebuhr, "enjoys a bliss like that of creating;" and, we may add, he, who carefully studies the records and memorials of past ages, enjoys the pleasure of a new existence. The sphere of his intellectual vision is enlarged, and the objects of delightful contemplation indefinitely multiplied. Such study is not only pleasant but useful. It awakens serious thought, checks presumption, chastens the imagination and rectifies the judgment. Without a knowledge of the past, we cannot act discreetly for the present, nor fully appreciate our privileges and obligations. Whoever, therefore, sincerely questions the past, becomes more prudent; and, whoever gives earnest heed to its responses, becomes a wiser and a better man. The Creator has implanted in the soul an instinctive reverence for antiquity. The "everlasting hills" derive not a little of their sublimity from their

age. Truth is more venerable because it is permanent and unchangeable. Every tie, that binds us to former ages, is sacred; and every memorial, which time has spared, serves as a landmark to guide us or warn us in our pilgrimage to eternity.

If it were possible for thoughts, emotions and principles to be imaged upon the canvass, like the features of a natural landscape, and some divine artist had power to present to us a moral panorama of past ages, from the beginning of time to the present hour, with what eagerness should we all rush to the exhibition, to gaze upon this most instructive, most enchanting, unequalled representation of human life! How many thrilling associations would cluster round that period when the soul of man first waked to conscious activity! With what intense interest should we watch the subsequent conflict of reason with passion, and its final triumph over a depraved nature, as it gave birth to civilization, government and laws! With what delight should we scan all the operations of intellect, and scrutinize every new development of mind, as the light of science and literature gradually broke forth upon a world of darkness! With what admiration should we gaze upon the venerable features of antiquity, as generation after generation passed in review before us, with all their thoughts, emotions and feelings, as fixed and changeless as eternity! With what reverence should we view those illustrious teachers of mankind, who have left the impress of their own characters upon the race, and the memorial of whose greatness is engraven, in living characters, upon the soul of man!

Such a view of the past, however, is not absolutely essential to a competent knowledge of its history. We need not call up the sleeping dead to question them; for they have already bequeathed to us the results of their experience. In the records of the past, the thinking spirit still lives, still speaks. Whatever is truly valuable in the creations of intellect or art, "men will not willingly let die." Of the world's benefactors and teachers, we may now say as the philosophic Tacitus said of his admired Agricola, "Quidquid amavimus, quidquid mirati sumus, manet mansurumque est in animis hominum, in eternitate temporum, fama rerum." Through the instrumentality of written language, time and space are virtually annihilated. Nations living remote from each other are intimately associated, and the very ends of the earth are united. Through the same medium, early and recent ages meet, and, mingling their intellec-

tual treasures, leave them as a rich legacy to coming generations. Thus the productions of gifted minds are not left to perish, neglected and forgotten; but embalmed in the literature of their age they escape "decay's effacing fingers," and live for ages after the animated dust of their authors has "returned to the dust as it was." In the lore that has come down to us from other days, the student can still commune with the spirits of the illustrious dead. The philosophers, the orators, the historians and poets of antiquity still speak to us in the very words which they chose for the dress of their undying thoughts. "Shining through the darkness of ages, they still remain stars of changeless and unequalled brilliancy." Their works have served to enrich and embellish the intellects of those, who, in later times, have created the literature of their respective countries. All the civilized nations of the earth have drank from the same common fountain. Many of the most polished modern languages are but channels, through which, from the same exhaustless reservoir, flow streams of knowledge, fertilizing and enriching the world of thought and feeling. The imagination of the poet, the eloquence of the orator, the understanding of the historian and the critical acumen of the philosopher have all been trained and matured by these same great teachers. The principles of their philosophy, poetry and oratory originated in the nature of man, and are as permanent and universal as the essential attributes of humanity. Hence they are adapted to all nations and all ages. They have been so freely adopted by subsequent writers, and so fully incorporated in their works, that their origin is almost forgotten, and they are regarded as the common property of the literati. The golden coin has been so often exchanged that its superscription is effaced, and the fortunate possessor now enjoys the reward of the original miner.

Thus the treasury of modern science and literature is replenished by the spoils of ages; and our philosophers and poets are wearing laurels, plucked from the brows of ancient sages and bards. Every generation adds something to the world's intellectual treasures. The literature of our own age, therefore, possesses elements as ancient as the origin of human civilization. There is not a civilized nation of past times, to which our scholars are not indebted. They laid the foundations upon which we are building. They enriched the soil from which the human mind now derives its nutriment. They originated

many of the arts and much of the literature, which are reflecting honor upon our institutions. Yet our nation, like a pigmy perched upon a giant's shoulders, enjoying a purer air, a clearer vision and a more extended prospect, affects to despise the honored dead, and boasts of its own success in literature, in arts and in arms.

The languages to which modern nations are most deeply indebted are thus beautifully characterized by Coleridge: "Greek—the shrine of the genius of the old world, as universal as our race; as individual as ourselves; of infinite flexibility; of indefatigable strength; with the complication and distinctness of nature herself; with words like pictures; with words like the gossamer film of summer, at once the variety and picturesqueness of Homer; the gloom and intensity of Æschylus; not compressed to the closest by Thucydides, nor fathomed to the bottom by Plato; not sounding with all its thunders nor lit up with all its ardors under the Promethean torch of Demosthenes: and Latin—the voice of empire and of war, of law and of state, rigid in its construction, reluctantly yielding to the flowery yoke of Horace, although opening glimpses of Greek-like splendor in the occasional inspirations of Lucretius, proved to the utmost by Cicero and by him found wanting, yet majestic in its barrenness, impressive in its conciseness, the true language of history, uniform in its air, whether touched by the stern and haughty Sallust, by the open and discursive Livy, or by the reserved and thoughtful Tacitus."

But it is not my object to eulogize the ancient languages. They have outlived the ravages of time and barbarism. Like the native diamond, they have acquired a higher polish by incessant use, and, in some instances, have received new lustre from the very blows that were dealt to mar their beauty. Omitting, therefore, the intrinsic excellence of these languages, as instruments of thought, and the rich materials of poetry, history and philosophy which they contain, let us contemplate the influence of a diligent and judicious study of them upon the development of the youthful mind.

The classics have probably been injured as much by indiscreet friends as by open enemies. When it is gravely announced that the classics are the storehouse of all knowledge, that every modern author only repeats, for the thousandth time, what was better said by the ancients, and that they are the only efficient helps to a liberal education, the common sense of the intelligent

reader revolts at such groundless assertions. We do not affirm, therefore, that the ancients possessed all wisdom—only that they were wise; nor that a knowledge of the classics is absolutely essential to a good education—only that it is highly important; nor that classical study should alone or chiefly occupy the student's attention—but that it ought to hold a prominent place in every system of education which claims to be *liberal*. The design of all intellectual training is to develop and strengthen the native faculties of the mind. It does not aim at mere acquisition, but at origination. Its design is, not so much to learn what others have thought wisely, as to think wisely ourselves; not so much to accumulate as to originate thoughts. It is rather learning *how* to think, than *what* to think; providing intellectual strength and skill, rather than intellectual stores. The great object of the young student, therefore, is to expand and invigorate the mind, to promote a harmonious development of all its powers; to improve the memory, control the attention, give accuracy and discrimination to the judgment, refinement and elegance to the taste, and to impart to all these faculties such a manly vigor and compactness, as will enable him to grapple successfully with the most difficult and abstruse questions of philosophy, and, at the same time, appreciate and enjoy the most splendid creations of imagination. But, some one may ask, Do you pretend that the classics can accomplish this great work alone? Most certainly not. A mere classical scholar is by no means a thoroughly educated man. A complete education contemplates other objects besides intellectual culture. Man needs physical and moral as well as mental training. He has a will to be regulated, passions to be governed, appetites to be checked, and affections to be cultivated. The influence of classical study in these respects, it is not our object now to discuss. We wish to show its utility as *an intellectual discipline*; and, be it remembered, while we maintain the importance and excellence of such discipline, we do not exclude other sciences or deny their utility. We would not recommend the exclusive application of the mind to any department of knowledge. It is only the combined influence of different studies which can make the finished scholar, the able reasoner and deep thinker. While we make these concessions in favor of other sciences, we may safely assert, that the study of the languages is the best discipline for the tyro, and one of the most valuable helps to the mature scholar. The mathematics

and metaphysics are suited to a more advanced stage of education, and are peculiarly adapted to develop the reasoning powers, though less efficient in the cultivation of a correct taste, a chastened imagination and a tenacious memory.

A great part of the work of education is preparatory. The foundation must be laid broad and deep before a stable superstructure can be reared. How often have we been told that the mind, like the body, requires exercise in order to its complete development? Who does not know, that without that exercise, the mind must forever remain infantile and weak? It should be the first object of the teacher, therefore, to promote intellectual activity. It is in vain to crowd the young mind with facts and theories; the understanding must be enlarged before it can contain; the judgment must be matured before it can decide; the memory must be strengthened before it can retain; the taste must be cultivated before it can distinguish. Knowledge cannot be poured into the mind, like water into a cask—as the ancient sophists taught—without regard to capacity. As well might you teach the infant to walk, by presenting to his eye the process upon a canvass, as teach the young pupil to think, by the bare presentation of facts. In both cases, the child must exercise his own powers; and that he may properly exercise his mind, he must be furnished with appropriate subjects of contemplation. The proper stimulus must be applied, and a right direction given to his thoughts. If the material be such as to employ all the powers of the mind at once, time will be saved, and great advantage secured. The mind is enlarged by expansion and not by accretion. The true index of its greatness is its power to originate and execute, not a mere capacity to contain. We should not aim to make the mind a mere reservoir of other men's thoughts, but a living fountain, sending forth its own refreshing streams. A student may acquire the elements of universal science, and, by mere dint of memory, make his head a storehouse of facts, and yet be a mere sciolist. If he has made no effort to classify these facts, to investigate the causes and effects of events, to reason from premises, to draw conclusions from arguments—in a word, if he has taken no care “to preserve that delicate balance of all the powers, which constitutes the truly philosophic mind,” he has no claim to the title of *scholar*, much less to that of a *genius*. We cannot justly predicate intelligence of such a man any more than we can of an encyclopedia. They both contain the

thoughts of others, and will communicate them when consulted.

If the business of education has been properly stated, it follows that that course of study, which most effectually secures the object of all mental training, is the best. Let us now examine more particularly the claims of the classics to our attention. Let us notice their influence upon the individual faculties of the mind, the memory, the attention, judgment, imagination, taste and reasoning powers.

1. *In the acquisition of the words and grammatical forms of a new language, the memory is essentially improved.* This is perhaps one of the least important results of this discipline. The memory is more easily trained than any other faculty of the mind. Almost any exercise will be profitable to the memory of the child; still, in the process of a regular education, economy of time and mental advantage should determine our choice of means. If we take into view the collateral benefits which result from classical study as a discipline for the memory, its influence in creating mental capacity and stimulating to mental effort, by invigorating the mind, and, at the same time, furnishing the richest materials of thought, it may be questioned whether we can select a better exercise for the young student. No *scholar* will deny the great importance of a tenacious memory, if the other powers of the mind are properly matured. It is commonly believed that a good memory is not the usual concomitant of a great intellect; and, that it is the prerogative of true genius to invent, not to retain. The notion is equally prevalent, that close application and accurate scholarship are incompatible with superior mental endowments. Because genius is sometimes eccentric, and, either from indolence or perversity, neglects that culture which is essential to the growth of common minds, every unfledged witling, forsooth, possessed of the requisite indolence and aversion to study, presumes to play the genius by aping his follies. Every reflecting mind will acknowledge that accuracy of memory is essential to correct judgment; for, in order to discriminate between things that differ, a man must readily call to mind all the circumstances that constitute that difference; else he will decide preposterously. We cannot arrive at safe and equitable conclusions respecting disputed points unless we can retain and weigh the evidence advanced upon both sides. Hence a good memory is absolutely indispensable to the judge, the advocate and public speakers of

every description. Cicero, in speaking of the value of a good memory to the orator, says: *Quid dicam de thesauro rerum omnium, memoria? quæ nisi custos inventis cogitatisque rebus et verbis adhibeatur, intelligimus, omnia, etiamsi præclarissima fuerint in oratore, peritura.**

In the ordinary process of education, the memory frequently receives undue attention, and is cultivated at the expense of higher intellectual powers. "Young learners," says Dr. Jahn, "are accustomed to do violence to the faculty of memory, when they earnestly strive to learn every thing *by rote*, or, at least, to retain it in the memory. By efforts of this nature, which are overstrained, they fatigue the memory, deprive it of its natural vigor, and debilitate it; whence it comes, that they remember what they obtain in this manner with the greatest difficulty, and, of course, easily forget it. The memory loves freedom, and is refreshed, nourished and strengthened by it." Hence, in educating the young mind, the memory should not be unduly tasked, but only trained to a spontaneous, healthy activity, in co-operation with the other mental powers. In the discipline we propose, there is little danger of giving a disproportionate employment to the memory. If the languages are properly taught and studied, the pupil must *think* and *reason* and *decide* as well as remember.

2. *The study of the languages enables the student to command the attention at will, to fix it, for any length of time, upon a single point, and to form those habits of patient investigation and nice discrimination, which are essential to intellectual eminence.* This is the most difficult and painful part of the whole business of education. Indeed, it is difficult for the best trained minds to gain a perfect control of the attention, so as to command it at will and concentrate it for a longer or shorter period, upon a given subject. This habit is by no means the gift of nature. The mind naturally loves ease or amusement, better than toil and solid improvement. It is disinclined to patient thought. It loves to indulge its own idle reveries, to sport with its own spontaneous musings, to brood over the creations of its own imagination, and to follow its own vagaries to the ends of the earth. "Every man who has instructed others," says Dr. Johnson, "can tell how much patience it requires to recall vagrant inattention, to stimulate sluggish indifference, and

* De Oratore, Liber 1: 5.

to rectify absurd misapprehensions." "In order to grapple successfully with the difficulties of science, the mind should be brought to the task, in a collected and unruffled state. No half subdued gust of passion should start up, no melancholy train of thought should pour in its muddy current, no sudden start of skittish fancy or engrossing remembrance of darling diversion, no dreams of romance should come in to ruffle the smooth surface. The whole soul should be only a mirror of thought, whose every image should be well defined and without distortion."

Such a perfect control of the emotions, passions and thoughts can only be acquired by the truly philosophic mind, and that by intense application and rigid discipline. Still, trial, effort and practice may do much, even for the feeblest intellect. Confined attention is always irksome to the undisciplined mind, and it readily welcomes any amusing day-dream, which may help to expel unwelcome thoughts. This subject is so happily illustrated by Dr. Beecher in his "Plea for Colleges," that I cannot forbear quoting his remarks. "Human indolence abhors this habit [of confined attention] as nature does a vacuum; and the mind can be brought to it only by the power of habitual training. It is this aversion to close attention, which produces in the early stages of college life, so many partial insurrections against the languages and mathematics; and such profound and eloquent dissertations upon the inutility of the one, and the folly of plodding through the sterile regions of the other; and such warm-hearted eulogies of the literature and various knowledge, which glitter on the surface, and for the acquisition of which the eye and the ear and the memory may suffice; with little taxation of thought and mental power, in which the inspirations of genius are idolized and hard study stigmatized; in which, instead of putting in requisition the whole energy of the soul to turn the key of knowledge, the young gentleman may skip through college with kid gloves and rattan, worship Bacchus and Venus, and cultivate the graces before the glass and before the ladies; and take his diploma, with all his college honors blushing thick upon his vacant head;—a system of education that might suffice to qualify men to govern monkeys, but never to form and govern mind."

Now it is found, by long experience, that the study of the languages is an excellent remedy for languid attention and intermittent application. It is impossible to advance a single

step without careful attention. The interpretation of language requires thought, reflection and reasoning. In the more difficult passages it requires undivided attention and intense application. The student must not only have a clear idea of the separate meaning of the words, but also of the thought presented to the reader by their combination. He must not only be familiar with the general meaning of each word, but he must know its particular meaning in the passage he is examining. He must form a just conception of the import of each sentence, and of its relation to the context. The precise thing indicated by every word and every sentence must be presented to the mental eye, and the exact shade of thought which lay in the author's mind, must be exhibited under new forms, and in new relations, so as not to lose one of its original characteristics. This requires a careful attention to all the circumstances of the writer's situation,—the time, the place and the cause of his writing. The author's peculiar mental and physical constitution, his mode of life and habits of thinking should also be investigated. Sometimes an author cannot be fully understood and appreciated without an intimate knowledge of the geographical, commercial and political condition, domestic manners, mental habits, private and public life of the people to which he belonged. So that frequently the whole field of ancient lore must be explored, and the whole world of antiquities be laid under contribution to illustrate a single author.

The connection of each word, thought and paragraph, with every other portion of the work, must be carefully scrutinized, lest in translating we make the writer contradict himself. The nature of the subject discussed, and the logical sequence of the arguments must also be noticed, so that our interpretation may not be incongruous or irrelevant. This process requires a vigorous exercise of the powers of invention and comprehension. Thus the mind is kept in a constant state of healthy activity and pleasurable excitement. Its natural appetency for new truths and new relations is abundantly gratified. The pleasure of acquisition beguiles the tediousness of severe study, and the habit of patient investigation and critical analysis is formed without the consciousness of fatigue. "The power of making nice distinctions, and of separating things, which, to the ignorant and inexperienced, appear alike," says Prof. Stuart, "is one of the most important powers ever acquired and exercised by the human mind. I must believe that linguistic study, di-

rected as it ought to be, viz. to acquire a knowledge of *things* that are designated by the words of a foreign language, is one of the most important means of improving and strengthening the faculty of nice discernment, that is within the reach of a young man." The same author acknowledges himself more indebted to this discipline than to all his other studies. *The judgment* is also called into active exercise, during the whole process of interpretation, in unravelling and recomposing every sentence and paragraph, but more especially in analyzing an entire work. The same faculty may be judiciously exercised in comparing synonyms, in determining their exact shades of difference, and in deciding why a particular word is used in a given place instead of another. In reading different authors, their peculiarities may be noticed, their excellencies or defects compared, and their merits determined. In this way, even the young student may create for himself a standard of merit, and form some notion of a higher and philosophical criticism. When he has once learned to think with precision, and to discriminate with accuracy, he will easily command right words and forcible expression for the vehicle of his thoughts. The classical student, if he have clear ideas and definite notions of what he wishes to communicate, cannot want for words. His familiarity with the best models will generally secure him from inaccuracies in the use of language and offences against taste.

3. *The study of the classics tends to refine, chasten and exalt the imagination.* Perhaps there is no one of the native powers of the mind, which usually exerts so important an influence upon our happiness or misery in this life, as the imagination. If properly trained and directed, it may become the source of the most exquisite pleasure; if neglected and abused, of the most excruciating torment. In those departments of literature which are the peculiar province of the imagination, the ancients stand unrivalled. In their poetry and oratory, the student is introduced to the most splendid creations of genius. It is the prevailing opinion of some of our best critics, that the infancy of society is most favorable to poetic excellence. Every thing then is new. All the impressions of the bard are fresh and vivid. The current of his thoughts gushes out warm from nature's living fount. As men advance in society, they become less susceptible to those lively emotions, excited by an ardent imagination. They deal more in general ideas and cold ab-

stractions. The reasoning powers become more acute, the imagination more tame. The experimental sciences, which require time for maturity, advance with the improvement of society, while poetry remains stationary or retrogrades. "As civilization advances," says Macaulay, "poetry almost necessarily declines. In proportion as men know more and think more, they look less at individuals, and more at classes. They therefore make better theories, and worse poems. They give us vague phrases instead of images, and personified qualities instead of men. They may be better able to analyze human nature than their predecessors. But analysis is not the business of the poet. His office is to portray, not to dissect." "The Greeks," says Menzel, "translated beautiful nature; the middle ages translated faith; we translate our science into poetry."

If this theory be true, the student can kindle the true poetic enthusiasm in his own bosom, only by stealing a coal from the altar of the ancient muses. A thorough acquaintance with ancient poetry will undoubtedly give him a just notion of the office of the imagination in literature, and reveal to him the secret process by which this "shaping spirit" creates the magic wonders of its power. It is not enough that the scholar views and admires these unequalled productions of genius; he must become familiar with them and feel their influence. It is not sufficient to notice and treasure up the beautiful conceits and striking expressions of an author; but he must strive to reproduce in himself the inspiration of the bard and the enthusiasm of the orator. He must, for the time, forget self, and, in imagination at least, exchange places with the author, live in the very midst of the stirring scenes that called forth the orator's pathos, or kindled the poet's fire, breathe in his spirit, be moved by the same impulses of feeling that actuated him, be touched by his sorrow, be melted by his tears, catch his fire, feel the same emotions of sublimity, and enjoy the same beauties that elevated or ravished his soul, soar with him in imagination, and train the whole intellectual being to like modes of thought. In this way he may acquire sufficient strength and nerve to wield the giant armor of men of other days.

By this process alone, can the student become an adept in classic lore. Some *practical men* may cry out: "Enthusiasm! extravagance!" Admit that it is enthusiasm. Great attainments were never made in any branch of literature, science or art, without some degree of professional enthusiasm. This de-

votion of eminent scholars and artists to their favorite pursuits is the very secret of their success. The geologist is in raptures at the discovery of some antediluvian reptile or more recent petrification. The philosophic antiquarian gazes with mingled awe and reverence at the remains of ancient art,—those magnificent ruins and marvellous columns that stand upon the soil beneath which countless generations sleep,

Flinging their shadows from on high,
Like dials which the wizard time
Hath raised to count his ages by.

The physician boasts of his splendid illustrations of morbid anatomy, and of his beautiful specimens of diseased bones ; and no one objects to this devotion to a particular department of study, this professional enthusiasm. On the contrary, every intelligent man commends it as the very key that unlocks the temple of science.

4. *The taste is refined and matured by this same discipline.* By constant association with refined society the individual is himself refined. The mind, in like manner, is moulded by the objects it contemplates. By long familiarity with these finished models of composition, the principles of philosophic criticism are gradually acquired, and a cultivated taste is unconsciously formed, so that, in writing, the student instinctively adopts what is beautiful in sentiment and faultless in expression, and rejects what is vulgar and anomalous. Though he may forget every word and every thought he has ever learned from ancient authors, his time will not have been lost. There still remains in the soul “an intellectual residuum,” a kind of mental precipitate, which, though differing from all the elements that were originally thrown into the intellectual crucible, still contains their very essence, and is superior to them all. The student’s taste is *classical*. And can we use a more expressive epithet ? Can there be higher praise ? After long acquaintance with classic excellencies, he has an intuitive perception of the beauties of a literary production. He does not need to recur to the standard he once used. He has risen from the condition of a learner to that of judge, and his nice perception of the beauties of a finished composition has become a part of his mental constitution. The man, who has been thus educated, can scarcely become so degraded as to lose entirely his taste for the beautiful, the poetic and the sublime in literature. Nor is this disci-

pline, which thus forms the taste and polishes the mind, a mere unrequited toil, destitute of pleasure or profit. There is a pleasure in mere intellectual activity. We are so constituted, that without exertion *we cannot enjoy*. Knowledge is the proper aliment of the soul, and the highest mental enjoyment results from the uninterrupted pursuit, and the constant acquisition of new truths. A philosopher once said: "If the gods would grant me all knowledge, I would not thank them for the boon; but if they would grant me the everlasting pursuit of it, I would render them everlasting thanks." When the student commences a course of classical study, he does not enter upon a barren desert, with only here and there an oasis to gladden his heart, but a land of hill and dale, whose eminences are clothed with perpetual sunlight, and in whose bosom sleep the treasures of a world.

5. *Classical study is eminently useful in strengthening the reasoning powers.* The art of reasoning is one of the most complicated and difficult of all arts. It can be acquired only by long and laborious training. Perfection in this art would require all knowledge. The noblest productions of human reason have resulted from the combined influence of all liberal studies. The higher mathematics furnish an excellent discipline for minds that have already been partially matured by an appropriate early education. But as mathematical reasoning alone admits of absolute certainty, and all moral reasoning is based upon probabilities, classical study is found to be an excellent co-worker with the mathematics and metaphysics, in preparing men for the diversified employments of life. In most of our daily avocations, we reason from probable evidence. The difficulty of this process is increased by the ambiguity of human language. In the business of translating from a foreign tongue, the mind is constantly employed in weighing evidence, and balancing probabilities. It is made familiar with the very process of reasoning which we need to employ in the intercourse of life. "The mind," says Dugald Stewart, "in following any train of reasoning beyond the circle of the mathematical sciences, must necessarily carry on, along with the logical deduction expressed in words, another logical process, of a far nicer and more difficult nature,—that of fixing, with a rapidity which escapes our memory, the precise sense of every word which is ambiguous, by the relation in which it stands to the general scope of the argument."

Now this is precisely the student's occupation who is translating a foreign language. He is incessantly employed in determining the meaning of words from the connection in which they stand, constantly weighing evidence and drawing conclusions, if he does not use a translation; for, in that case, he is only exercising his memory. Each word has various significations. He must carefully examine the sentence, and then fix upon the appropriate definition. In this way he is for years training the mind to the most accurate discrimination in comparing words, and adjusting nice shades of meaning. Thus he learns to practise the most delicate and difficult part of the art of reasoning. In what other way could one become so intimately acquainted with the right use of language, which is the great instrument of all ratiocination? Without a minute knowledge of definitions, and of the nice shades of meaning which result from the subject discussed, and the connection of the argument, no person can speak with precision, or reason with force and perspicuity. Many eminent teachers have been so fully convinced of the utility of classical studies, in invigorating and maturing the mental powers, that they give it as their opinion, that, if two students of equal capacity be put upon a course of study, for six years—the one pursuing English studies wholly, and the other devoting one-third of the time to the languages—at the end of the course the classical student, by his superior discipline, will have acquired a better English education, aside from his knowledge of the languages, than the other. An eminent French philosopher supposes if two boys were put to study—the one upon the classics and the other upon the sciences—and, “on leaving the first class,” the classical scholar should, by some accident, lose every word he had learned, but retain his intellectual powers in the same state of maturity as before the loss, that this scholar, beginning his acquisitions anew, would, at the close of his course, be better educated and better prepared for the business of life than the other, who had devoted the whole time to other pursuits. This may be an extravagant opinion, yet by no means so extravagant as many would suppose. It is undoubtedly true that the time which many students think absolutely wasted upon the classics, is the very seed-time of life. It is the apprenticeship of mind; the time when they are acquiring strength and skill for greater effort; the time when they are preparing their weapons for future intellectual warfare.

A distinguished philosopher remarks: "The real way to gain time in education is to *lose* it; that is, to give it up to the natural development of the faculties: not to be in haste to construct the edifice of knowledge, but first to prepare the materials and lay deep the foundations. The time that is yielded to the mind for unfolding itself though slowly is not lost; but to derange its natural progress, by forcing on it premature instruction, is to lose not only the time spent, but much of the time to come. Give your pupil memory, attention, judgment, taste; and believe, whatever his vocation in life may be, he will make more rapid and certain proficiency, than if you had loaded him with knowledge, which you cannot answer for his bringing to any result, and which his organs, weak and variable, and his unconfirmed faculties, are as yet little able to bear."

In this connection it may not be improper to notice some of the current objections against the classics. The common objection against their practical utility has already, I trust, been answered by showing that the study of them develops and matures the young mind. Whatever expands the soul, induces reflection, furnishes food for thought, subdues sense and exalts reason, is eminently *practical*.

Aside from their influence in forming the mind, their utility might be advocated as the medium of communicating valuable information that cannot be conveniently learned from other sources. In learning the language of a nation, the student becomes acquainted with their mental habits, their progress in philosophy and morals, their history, chronology, private character and public institutions. A mere vocabulary of the words used by a people will show their progress in science, philosophy and the arts, and a careful analysis of their peculiar modes of expression, the structure of their language and the characteristics of their style, will prove a very valuable help to the study of intellectual philosophy. Words and thoughts are so intimately associated, that the study of language is, in one sense, the study of mind; and *comparative philology* may justly be styled *the comparative anatomy of mind*. It is a common remark of students: "I wish to study what I can use in the business of life." Now what can be more useful, especially to one whose business it is to persuade and to convince, than to be thoroughly versed in the philosophy of mind and its operations; to be well acquainted with all the springs of human action? If a scholar will study only what will be available as an intellectual fund in

after life, he must confine himself chiefly to the elementary branches of an English education, particularly to arithmetic and book-keeping. But if he would entertain large and liberal views, his course of study must be equally extended and liberal.

From young men who contemplate the legal profession, we frequently hear such sentiments as this: 'I wish to give my attention to such authors as will furnish me with practical knowledge, polish my style, give me a command of language and prepare me for a public speaker.' I reply, that there is no exercise that will so effectually prepare you for your contemplated duties, as the study you object to. Do you expect to spend your life in the use of language, to gain your subsistence by its use, and yet object to the study of it? But, says the objector, I do not intend to speak Latin or Greek. Very well: but if you can acquire a better knowledge of your own tongue, a more polished style and a more ready command of words, by the discipline of interpretation, is not this the very end you aim at? What, think you, gave birth to the clear, precise and logical reasonings of Cudworth, the profound thoughts and copious diction of Barrow and Howe, the transcendent, matchless eloquence of Taylor and Milton? Did they acquire their unrivalled distinction as scholars by studying English literature? Most certainly not; for they had none or almost none to study. These were the men who made English literature. Their minds were trained almost wholly by classical study.

But, says the objector, did not Shakspeare contribute as largely to the formation of English literature as any you have named? "He," as Ben Johnson said, "had small Latin and less Greek." True, Shakspeare possessed superior native endowments, and could accomplish without a thorough education more than others can with it. He was an exception to all general rules. Besides, if his case shows that classical studies are useless, it shows that all systematic education is useless. If all that is requisite to make a great man be to turn him loose upon the world, in his youth, and leave him dependent on his own exertions, it is a wonder the world is not full of Shakspeares and Franklins; for certainly a multitude of young men are thus left to their own efforts, and under circumstances far more favorable to improvement than those of Shakspeare or Franklin. Six thousand years have produced but one Shakspeare, while they have produced thousands of good rea-

soners and deep thinkers; and this is quite as much as most young men may aspire to. Indeed, if all our youth were left to their own resources, it is probable that multitudes would imitate Prince Hal or Falstaff, where one would conceive the idea of such a character, and write down the conception for the instruction and amusement of others.

"Many men," says Mr. Cheever, "think no employments practical, but those that are immediately mechanical; or those that minister to our bodily necessities; or those that afford knowledge whose application is immediate and evident. To such men, God himself cannot appear, as the Creator of the universe, as an architect of practical wisdom; for he has covered the earth with objects, and the sky and the clouds with tints, whose surpassing beauty is their only utility; but whose beauty is eminently useful, because man who beholds it, is immortal; because it wakes the soul to moral contemplation, excites the imagination, softens the sensibilities of the heart, and throws round every thing in man's temporal habitation the sweet light of poetry reflected from the habitations of angels, telling him both of his mortality and immortality, giving him symbols of both, and holding with him a perpetual conversation of the glory, wisdom and goodness of God.

'To me the meanest flower that blows can give
Thoughts, that do often lie too deep for tears.'

"To such men the employment of Milton, while writing *Paradise Lost*, would have seemed less practical than that of the shoemaker at his next door; nor would it alter their views to represent that all the shoes the man could possibly make in a whole life time, would be worn out in a very few years, while the divine poem would be a glorious banquet and a powerful discipline to all good men and great minds for ages. Whatever in any degree disciplines the mind for effort, is practical, though for every thing else it be utterly useless."

No man can appreciate the value of mental discipline till he has felt its influence; and if he is unacquainted with any science or department of study, this very fact precludes the possibility of his forming a correct estimate of its utility. The only way to judge of what is practical is *to be* practical; and the only way to arrive at a just estimate of the real utility of any branch of science, is *to study it and master it*. The true standard, by which we ought to estimate the benefit of intel-

lectual training, is the capacity it creates for doing good. Some students, whose love of ease creates in them an aversion to all laborious exercise either of mind or body, seek a substitute for the prescribed course of collegiate study in extended reading. They admire the ready and flippant student, who, having a smattering of all knowledge, astonishes the uninitiated. They diligently inquire the cause of his marvellous fluency and ready wit, and find that he is a general scholar, a lover of miscellany. Hence they resolve to be readers, and scout the languages and mathematics, which so cramp the intellect, stifle the buddings of genius, and make a man a mere prosing pedant. They plunge at once into an ocean of miscellany, and seize upon this novel, that new poem, and the other review or pamphlet, studiously avoiding the good old standard works of English literature, because, forsooth, they require study, and are almost as difficult to be understood as Latin. After carefully pursuing this labor-saving process of education four years, the student graduates, a mere superficial sciolist, with a small capital of fancy articles, to please the sentimental and romantic, and without the means of increasing it. It would be better to spend four years in the catacombs of Egypt, deciphering hieroglyphics, than devote the same time exclusively to miscellaneous reading. The student would come out of his den better prepared for the business of life, with more strength of intellect for grappling with difficult subjects, than if he had spent his time in the mere dissipation of unthinking superficial reading. I do not object to such reading, in its proper place; but it should be resorted to as a relief from severer studies. All intellectual eminence is the result of patient thought. Mere reading without study or reflection will no more expand the young mind, than listening to sweet music. Either occupation would beguile the tedious hours of an unemployed mind. Hard study, patient, protracted study, discriminating study is absolutely essential to success in literary and scientific pursuits. Miscellaneous reading does not furnish the necessary discipline. The young man, who vainly imagines that such pursuits will qualify him for "the stern realities of life," and resolves to devote no more time to those studies, whose practical utility is not apparent to his feeble mind, than barely to escape public disgrace, by that very resolve dooms himself to eternal mediocrity, if not to inferiority. Before such a person reads polite literature to polish his mind, it may be well for him to get some mind to

polish. Reading, to be profitable, must be something more than a mere "beggarly day-dreaming." "Read," says Bacon, "not to contradict and confute, nor to believe and take for granted, nor to find talk and discourse, but to weigh and consider. Some books are to be tasted, others to be swallowed, and some few to be chewed and digested." It might be added, many are not to be read at all; for it can scarcely be doubted that an indiscriminate gormandizing of popular literature only enfeebles the intellect, and begets a sickly sentimentalism. In regard to the alleged immoral tendency of the study of classic mythology, I can only say I have never felt it nor discovered it in others. It is, however, gravely maintained that ancient authors foster a bloodthirsty spirit, and taint the soul by their licentiousness. It is also maintained, by some reformers, that jails and penitentiaries are mere incentives to crime; yet I cannot learn that those who live in the vicinity of such institutions are uncommonly vicious, nor have I ever known a man to be prompted to steal or rob, by visiting or passing by a prison. Neither have I known a student to become a heathen, or even *heathenish* by studying the classics. I would ask every schemer in education to visit our colleges, and inquire who are the greatest heathens there. I am confident they are not the best classical scholars. I would say to such reformers as Agricola did to his troops: "question your own eyes." Who are the idle, the disorderly and vicious in our literary institutions? Is it they who are most devoted to classical pursuits? No: for they have no time to be dissipated. It is a rare thing to find one, who seeks to excel as a classical scholar, dissipated or immoral. The disturbers of college, the corrupters of the young are generally those who neglect such studies, who have not sufficient elevation of soul to appreciate them, and who find a more congenial employment in reading the corrupting novels and poetry of the age. An extended discussion of this point does not properly belong to my subject, and I leave it. I conclude in the language of Dr. Dana: "If there is a spirit abroad in our land which is corrupting our literature, which would exchange its solid strength for a feeble and meretricious splendor, which regards its surface more than its depth, let us resist it. In an age of too much glitter and ostentation, let us aim at nothing better or higher than solid knowledge, genuine wisdom, unostentatious goodness and substantial usefulness. In an age of ceaseless revolution, let us remember that to *innovate* is not always to reform; and *that old truth is somewhat preferable to new error.*"

ARTICLE IV.

RELIGIOUS LITERATURE IN FRANCE AND SWITZERLAND:—GAUSSEN
ON DIVINE INSPIRATION.

By an American in Paris.

*Théopneustie, ou Pleine Inspiration des Saintes Ecritures : par
L. Gaussen.**Theopneustia, or the Plenary Inspiration of the Sacred Scrip-
tures : by L. Gaussen : pp. 477, 8vo. (Published by Delay,
No. 62 Rue Basse-du-Rempart, Paris.)*

THE three great races, which possess the greatest degree of civilization, and the greatest amount of moral and political influence in the world, are the English, or rather the Anglo-Saxon, the Germanic, and the French or Gallic. The first of these, including the branch which inhabits the United States and the colonies of Great Britain, probably exceeds forty-four millions of people; the second, forty-two millions; and the third, including portions of Switzerland and Belgium and the colonies of France, thirty-eight millions.

These races, though enjoying a civilization which may be said to be nearly equal, possess characteristics which strikingly distinguish them one from another. The first two, however, approximate much more nearly to each other—having in fact a common origin—than does either of them and the third. An inquiry into the origin of these differences in character—so perceptible, and yet not easy to portray—would be in the highest degree interesting; but it is wholly foreign to the object which we have in view in writing this article.

The Anglo-Saxon mind may be described as being eminently practical, clear in its conceptions, patient in its investigations and pursuits; the Germanic, more patient, more speculative, and more ardent. While the Gallic is more ardent still than that of the dwellers beyond the Rhine, more perspicacious, but greatly wanting in coolness, in patience, in application. We speak only of the most general characteristics of these races

In literature the French are inferior to the English or Anglo-Saxon race in soundness of view, in clearness of argumentation, and in what may be called the love of the True. They are very inferior to the Germans in profound erudition ; and utterly abhor their love of speculation. They love that which is witty, brilliant, striking. But they have not the patience which is necessary to arrive at that which is profound.

What we have just said is characteristic of the national mind and its operations. No people have more genius, and yet no great nation has produced fewer of the grandest discoveries in science, or achieved fewer of the greatest processes of art. And as to literature, while they have displayed great genius, and a most vivid imagination, the overwhelming mass of their writers are frivolous, superficial and immature. This is unquestionably the character of their writers in general.

And yet, although the national character of the French may be designated as light, unstable, and fonder of show than of solidity, nothing is more certain than that when moulded by influences sufficiently powerful to control it, it undergoes the most remarkable transformations. In the pursuit of military glory, what toilsome campaigns have the French not made, what sanguinary battles have they not fought ! In pursuit of science, too, they have furnished some of the finest examples of indomitable perseverance.

But under no influence does the French mind seem to undergo so great a change as it does under that of religion. When made to feel the "powers of the world to come," and the motives which Christianity brings to bear upon the human heart, it seems to lose in a great measure those traits which we have described as being national. Calmness, sobriety, seriousness take the place of excessive excitability, frivolity and levity. Under this transforming influence, the French mind becomes remarkably adapted to the clear perception of the truth as revealed in the Bible, and the happy expression of it in spoken or written discourse. It is on this account that France has furnished many of the very ablest expounders of the Christian faith that the world has ever known, as well as many of its noblest advocates and most intrepid martyrs.

Rome, for ages, found in the Gallican church, her most distinguished defenders, and her brightest ornaments. Bossuet, Massillon, Bourdaloue, Fléchier and Fénelon are names than which none greater appear in her calendar of great men.

Their fame is coextensive with the literary and religious world. From the bosom of the Gallican church, too, even down to the present times, have gone forth the best missionaries whom Rome has ever employed to propagate her doctrines and extend her dominion.

And even the Protestants, persecuted as they have been, and trodden under the feet of their enemies, almost to annihilation, have furnished many able champions of the truth as it is in Jesus, especially during the 16th and 17th centuries. Notwithstanding that access to the colleges of France was denied to their young men, and they were compelled to depend upon what instruction the schools of their own despised sect afforded, or seek for better in the academies and universities of Switzerland, Germany and Holland, not a few of them rose to distinction, and compelled the admiration, in some cases, of even their enemies.

Let us for a moment speak of a few of them. And first of all, though not exactly first in the order of time, was Calvin—clarum et venerabile nomen,—who, whether he treated of the doctrines of Christianity, or expounded its sacred oracles, has not been surpassed in clearness of conception, in strength of argument, or in felicity of diction. He was one of those few great men whose names seem to be destined to descend to the remotest ages of futurity. His numerous and able productions are too well known to need a notice from us. His distinguished coadjutors in the glorious Reformation at Geneva, as well as in the adjoining Pays de Vaud, were Farel—the bold, ardent, powerful preacher, Viret—the amiable, the polished, the ingenious writer, as well as eloquent speaker, and Peter Olivetan, who first translated the Bible from the Hebrew and Greek originals. Theodore Beza, the friend of Calvin, his junior far in years and his inferior in natural gifts, was his successor in the chair of Theology at Geneva. He was the first President or Principal of the Academy; and his numerous writings attest the maturity of his mind, and the great extent of his erudition.

Whilst the above named great men labored, with others, who were either Frenchmen, or of French origin, and several of them had been banished from France, to introduce and establish the Reformation in French Switzerland, there were a few men, eminent in zeal and talent, who still continued, amidst the greatest obstacles, to promote it in France itself. Among these may be mentioned *Lafevre*, who deserves to be called the Fa-

ther of the Reformation in that country, and who was the author of valuable commentaries on the Scriptures; *Morlorat*, author of Commentaries on Isaiah and the New Testament; and others less distinguished.

In the 17th century, and the beginning of the 18th, there were not a few distinguished Protestant writers in France, among whom we may indicate as the most celebrated, *Philip de Mornay*, Count de Plessis, or, as he is commonly called, Du Plessis-Mornay, a layman of rank, and the very able author of treatises on the Church, on the Truth of the Christian Religion, on the Eucharist, History of the Papacy, &c.; *Peter Dumoulin*, author of a treatise on the Keys of the Church, History of the Monks, and other excellent works; *David Blondel*, whose works were numerous, treating of the Eucharist, the Primacy of the Church, the offices of Bishops and Presbyters, the Sibyls, a Defence of the Reformed Religion, in opposition to Richelieu, etc., etc.; *Du Bosc*, whose writings are excellent; *Claude*, whose sermons, essays and controversial writings are well known; *Samuel Bochart*, who wrote much on Sacred Geography, the Natural History of the Bible, and other subjects, besides many sermons (an interesting Memoir of this distinguished scholar has lately been written by the Rev. Mr. Paumier of Rouen); *Charles Drelincourt*, author of Consolations against the Fear of Death, besides works on many other subjects, together with three volumes of Sermons (two of his sons were also ministers of the Gospel and authors); *Stephen Gaussen*, ancestor of the author of the work which stands at the head of this article, and the author of a work on the Art of Preaching; *Le Sueur*, author of a work on Ecclesiastical History. To these names we may add those of *Amyrault*, *Girard des Bergeries*, *De Croi*, *Daillé*, *La Faye*, *Gaulart*, *Mestrezat*, *Demarets*, etc., and in later times those of the *Rabants* (Paul St. Etienne). During the same period, there lived in Geneva, either the whole or a portion of their lives, the *Turretins*, Benedict, Francis and John Alphonsus, all of them distinguished authors, and one of them, Francis, well known among us for his System of Theology and other writings; the *Spanheims*, Ezekiel and Frederick the Younger, well known for their numerous writings, as was their distinguished father Frederick Spanheim the Elder, who was some time a Professor of Theology at Geneva; *John Diodati*, who, though born in Lucca, was long a professor at Geneva, and is well known for his

translation of the Bible into the Italian, his translation of Father Paul's History of the Council of Trent into French; *Benedict Pictet*, author of a work on Christian Theology, in 3 vols. 4to, Christian Morality, in 8 vols. 12mo., and other works; *John Le Clerc*, author of a translation of the Bible and many other productions, and who spent most of his life in Holland.

During the 18th century, and especially the latter part of it, France produced no theologians of the Protestant school, who possessed any considerable merit. Nor is this fact wonderful. The revocation of the Edict of Nantes in 1685 had left the Protestants of that country without the slightest protection from law. Persecution raged until it finally rid the country of almost every vestige of a Protestant church. It is an absolute fact that for a considerable period, in the early part of that century, there was but one ordained Protestant minister (M. Roger, in Dauphiny) in all France. It is true that there were some French Protestant ministers in Germany, in Holland, and in America. The most celebrated of those who lived in the early part of that century was *Saurin*, who spent the greater part of his life in Holland, and preached his well known discourses in the Walloon church at the Hague. And as to Geneva, it had submitted to the reign, first, of a dead formalism, then of a cold Pelagianism, and finally of a worldly Socinianism. We know not that any men of great distinction flourished there after the death of Benedict Pictet—which occurred, we believe, in 1724—until the end of the 18th century. Some men of God, however, there were, in the ministry of that city and canton,

faithful found
Among the faithless, faithful only they.

We come now to more recent days, and shall take some notice of the most distinguished men whom God has raised up as advocates of the Protestant cause in both France and French Switzerland, since the beginning of the present century.

It was only in 1802—as we have stated in another place*—that the Protestant church received an acknowledged and legalized existence in France, by the Organic Articles which the Government enacted during the Consulate of Napoleon. From

* See Article X. in No. VIII. (new series) of the American Biblical Repository, on *Religious Liberty in France*.

the revocation of the Edict of Nantes in 1685 until the year 1802—that is, during a period of 117 years—the existence of the Protestants as a sect was not acknowledged in that country. Since 1802 they have been, by law, placed on the same footing with the Roman Catholics, and the churches of both are acknowledged as the established churches of the land, and receive equal protection and support. The consequence is that the Protestant church, for nearly forty years, has been steadily and gradually gaining strength. The present number of its pastors, supported by the Government—that is, of those who are in the Established churches,—is 640 ; and, including those who are not connected with the Established churches, the entire number of Protestant ministers in France—not including those who are English or American, and who preach not to French but English congregations—does not exceed seven hundred and fifty. As the Protestants have now advantages of education equal to those of the Roman Catholics, it might be expected that there would be found already some men among them of distinguished talents and attainments, who are beginning to make themselves known to the world, and who prove themselves not unworthy children of a church which produced, in bygone days, a Calvin, a Claude, a Du Plessis-Mornay, a Dumoulin, and others of scarcely inferior fame. It has been even so. France possesses already a number of Protestants, in the ministry and among the laity—most of whom are young men, or in the prime of life—who are men of fine talents and most respectable attainments, and who are making themselves known by their respective and most respectable writings.

Among these, and of what is termed the Evangelical or Orthodox Party (we hate the word *Party*, but cannot at this moment think of one which better expresses our idea), we may name, without disparaging others, among the pastors or ministers, the Rev. Dr. *Grand Pierre*, Director of the Missionary Institute at Paris, and author of several volumes of excellent sermons ; *Audebez*, who is pastor of a chapel in the same city, and author of a volume of valuable Discourses, which we have noticed in a preceding number of this work ;* *Juillierat-Chasseur*, one of the pastors in the Oratoire and Ste. Marie, who has published some Discourses, as well as some poems ; *Fred-*

* See the IVth number (new series) of the American Biblical Repository.

erick Monod (also a pastor in the same churches), who has published several discourses, and is the excellent editor of the valuable religious periodical called the *Archives du Christianisme* (Mr. Monod, we may here add, has three brothers in the ministry, one of whom is the Rev. *Adolphus Monod*, now a professor in the Protestant Theological Seminary at Montauban, and author of several eloquent sermons as well as some controversial pamphlets; another is Mr. *William Monod*, formerly pastor of a church at St. Quentin, and now editor of a literary journal at Geneva; and *Horace Monod*, the youngest, who is pastor of a church in Marseilles, and the translator of Professor Hodge's Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans); *Paumier*, pastor of a church at Rouen, and author of a Memoir of Bochart; *De Félice*, now Professor at Montauban, and author of several valuable essays and sermons, and well known in the United States as the interesting French correspondent of the New-York Observer: at the same Theological Seminary at Montauban are Professors *Jalaguier* and *Encontre*, both of whom have published, we believe, some valuable discourses, and they are also editors of a new and valuable periodical, called the *Revue Théologique*, which is published once in two months; *Roussel*, who is author of several popular tracts, *Scènes Evangeliques*, and other valuable and interesting books for children and youth, and is, withal, editor of the political and moral journal called *L'Espérance*; *Frossard*, pastor of a church at Nismes, and author of several interesting books and discourses; *A. Blanc*, who has published a number of good things; and *Bonifas-Guizot*, of Grenoble, who has also published several sermons, etc. We might increase this list by the names of quite a number more, who have published sermons delivered on important occasions.

The anti-evangelical party, as it is termed, or that portion of the Protestant clergy of France which is considered as rejecting, or lightly esteeming, some of the most important doctrines of the Christian system, as held by the great Reformers, have not so many authors among them, though they cannot be charged with a want of talent. *Athanasius Coquerel*, one of the pastors of the churches of the Oratoire and Ste. Marie at Paris, is considered the Coryphæus of their party. He is author of several volumes, on various subjects, which have had an extensive sale among the Protestants; *Martin Paschoud*, one of M. Coquerel's colleagues, has also published some things; *Fontanès*,

pastor at Nismes, who has published several Discourses and other works, and has edited, we believe, one or two periodicals; *Matter*, member of the Royal Council of Instruction, and author of an Ecclesiastical History, etc. To these we might add the names of several others, who have published more or less, and who are considered as appertaining to the same theological school or party.

We ought to add also the names of some laymen among the Protestants of France who are known as authors. Among these are Messrs. *H. Lutteroth*—editor of the *Semeur*, a very excellent literary and moral Review, which is published once a week, and which has existed nearly, if not quite, ten years, and been the means of doing much good, *Count Agénor de Gasparin*—an excellent young nobleman who has written in defence of religious liberty, and from whom not a little is expected in future, and *Guizot*, who is, however, a man of letters and a statesman rather than a religious author.

Nor are there wanting *ladies* who have contributed the influence of their pens to advance the cause of Christ. Among them we may name Mademoiselle de Chabaud-Latour, who has written and translated many things, and conducted a valuable periodical for youth; Madame Julius Mallet; Madame Bonifas-Guizot; and the late Madame Guizot, wife of the distinguished statesman mentioned above;—all these ladies have published more or less.

Nor should we omit to say that there are some French ministers of the gospel in adjoining countries who have attained some celebrity in France; and some of whom are known among us by their writings. They are such men as *Bonnet* at Frankfort-on-the-Maine, who has published several interesting volumes of discourses; *Secretan*, at the Hague, who has published some excellent sermons; and *Boucher*, at Brussels, who has published a number of tracts and sermons, and has translated Nevins' Thoughts on Popery, and some things from the English into French.

We have spoken, in what we have said of the period which has elapsed since 1802, only of living authors. But there have lived some excellent Protestant ministers in France, during this period, who have entered into their rest, but whose writings remain to do good. They are such men as the late devoted *Pyt*, *F. A Gonthier*, and above all, the distinguished and venerable *Stapfer*, whose death, last year, was felt to be so great a loss by the churches of France.

It will be seen, from what we have now stated, that the Protestants of France, of our times, have not been wanting in authors. It is true, indeed, that hitherto, those who have published the results of their studies have confined themselves too much to sermons, essays, and small works. With the exception of some ten or a dozen persons, they have not attempted any thing beyond single discourses or small volumes. This has been owing to the fact that most of these authors are comparatively young, and all are overwhelmed with pastoral duties, which demand almost every moment of their time. Surrounded as they are by numerous antagonists—not to say enemies—they have need of all their vigilance to protect their little flocks, and of much study, in order to interest the masses of the indifferent population in the midst of which they are endeavoring to plant the truth. Greater things, in the way of authorship, may unquestionably be expected of them in the time to come.

In French Switzerland the Protestants have published much more than their brethren in France have done during the last quarter of a century. Already they have authors who may almost be termed veterans in the use of the pen. There is the Rev. Dr. Malan in Geneva who has published many volumes, although he is not yet what might be called an old man. The publications of Dr. Malan, in the shape of tracts, sermons, controversial essays, and extended theological dissertations are numerous, and would make, if collected, some eight or ten volumes octavo. He began to wield the pen in his youth, and has not ceased until now, to assert and vindicate the truth in all possible ways; sometimes in song, but oftener in prose; sometimes in the witty and *tranchant* style of the popular pamphleteer; at another in the graver tone of the scholar.

Next to Dr. Malan, among the orthodox, we may mention him whose name we have placed at the head of this article, the Rev. Professor Gaussen, who was formerly pastor of the church of Satigny, a parish at a short distance from the city of Geneva, and within the limits of the canton, but now, and for eight or nine years past, professor in the new theological school in that city. Professor Gaussen has published many things, in the shape of controversial pamphlets, sermons for edification, and considerable volumes. Among the latter may be placed his excellent Lectures on Daniel, as well as the work under our present notice. All of his writings are characterized by that brilliant eloquence which distinguishes his discourses when delivered from the pulpit.

Of the same theological school is the Rev. Dr. *Merle d'Aubigné*, who, in addition to several smaller works, has published the first two volumes of his invaluable History of the Reformation. The remaining volumes are impatiently expected by the Protestant Christian public of France and Switzerland, and also by that of other countries. The volumes of this most interesting work which have appeared, have already been translated into English and published in London.

We increase the list by adding the name of the Rev. Mr. *Bost*, who has written a number of excellent works, one of which is a history of the Moravians, and has translated from the German into French the history of the Church written by the late Dr. Blumhardt, the Director or President of the Missionary Institute at Basle. Mr. Bost is a poet, and the author also of some very sweet music, as well as a writer of prose.

Of the same theological opinions, as it relates to all fundamental points, are Messrs. *Guers* and *Empeytaz*, who are pastors in a chapel of dissenters in Geneva, and who have published several useful and esteemed works, none of which are of any great extent.

Professor *Pilet-Joly*, also of the new Theological Seminary, has published some good things; as has also *M. Galland*, lately a professor in the same institution, but who is now pastor of a church in Switzerland.

Out of Geneva there are several evangelical and excellent writers who ought to be mentioned, such as *Vinet*, Professor in the University, or Academy as it is called, of Lausanne. Mr. Vinet has written many valuable works,—sermons, essays, &c. He is perhaps the most truly philosophical of all the French divines of the present day. We speak of him as being French in the same sense in which we have used this word in other parts of this article, viz. as denoting all who are of the French people, whether living in France, Switzerland or Belgium. Mr. Vinet now holds the important post of Professor in the Theological Department of the University of the city of Lausanne, and exercises a great and good influence over the students who come under his instruction. He has lately written a capital essay on the question of the union of Church and State. This essay is now in press; and will make a considerable volume. Mr. Vinet is against the union of Church and State, and has lately resigned the pastoral charge which he held in connexion with the state. He still remains professor.

We may add also the names of *Burnier*, *Vulliemin*, *Bauty*, *Henri Olivier*, *Gauthey*, *Vermeil*, and *A. Rochat*, who reside, most of them at least, in the Canton de Vaud, and who have all written more or less, and some of them very considerably ; and whose writings, we may add, are held in esteem. *M. Fred. de Rougemont*, a layman of distinguished talents and learning, of Neuchâtel, we believe, is also the author of several valuable publications. And we must not fail to add that some Swiss ladies have ably employed the pen for the advancement of truth, and especially for the instruction of the youth, among whom are Mademoiselles *Herminie Chavannes* and *Julie Miéville*.

Among the evangelical authors in Geneva whom death has removed within the last few years, were *Cellerier*, Sen., *Moulinié*, and the young and lamented Professor *Steiger*.

Of the anti-evangelical school or party in Geneva, the most distinguished writers are *Cellerier*, Jr., *Bouvier*, and *Chenevière*, who have published a number of works which are more or less relished by those who hold their opinions. But the anti-evangelical school of Geneva, like that of France, cannot boast of having produced many distinguished writers. The system which it holds, which is a mongrel theology, compounded of old Socinianism and modern German neology, has not vitality and zeal enough in it to make *Frenchmen* do much in the way of writing to promote it. To them, doctrines which require either the patience of German criticism to detect, or the profoundness of German metaphysics to elucidate (if we may so abuse the term), can never prove acceptable.

One thing is very striking in French theological writings ; it is the simplicity of conception, the clearness of style, and the directness of statement which almost universally prevail in them. The theology of the evangelical French authors, whether of the past or the present days, is eminently *biblical*. Unlike the Germans, in this and so many other respects, the well-ascertained declaration of God is every thing with them. On this account we value the theological writings of the French far more than we do those which have appeared beyond the Rhine. Less learned, less metaphysical than the Germans, the French theologians, somehow or other, more readily perceive, and more firmly lay hold of the true meaning of the Scriptures than they do. With all their levity, the French, as a people, have a deal of good sense. And as we have before stated, when their minds have been brought under the hallowing influences of the Gos-

pel, and baptized as it were by the Holy Ghost, no men become more able and convincing expounders of the sacred oracles. In proof of this we might cite Calvin, who as a commentator has never been surpassed in his attempts to give the *true meaning* of the inspired writers. The same remark might be made respecting several others of their older writers, as well as of not a few of their modern ones.

In the notice of French theological writers which we have just taken, we have said nothing of those of the Roman Catholic church during the same period. It fell not within the scope of our plan to do so. At another time we may, however, take up that subject, and indicate who have been the most important theological authors of that church in France during the last three centuries. At present, we must pass to the notice which we propose to give, in the remaining portion of this article, of the work which stands at its head. Of its distinguished author, we have already said a few words. We will only add, at present, that Professor Gaussen is a native of Geneva, of a wealthy and most respectable family, and that, after having preached the Gospel with eloquence and zeal, for several years, at Satigny, he was deprived of his pastoral charge by the Consistory of Geneva, for having dared to preach doctrines, and employ measures, for propagating the truth, which the venerable company of pastors of the city and canton did not relish. This tyrannical act led to a discussion which was eminently promotive of the truth, we believe, and which displayed the piety and talent of M. Gaussen to the greatest advantage. It was this affair, more than any other one thing, which led to the formation of the Evangelical Society of Geneva in 1831, and of the contemporaneous establishment of the new theological school of that city, and which owes its existence to that society. M. Gaussen was chosen Professor of Didactic Theology in that seminary at its very commencement. And as he possesses a sufficient fortune himself, his services are, and have ever been, wholly gratuitous. We will only add that he has borne much of the "reproach of Christ," and has borne it well. We pass now to the consideration of his book.

The subject of this book is the *Plenary Inspiration of the Sacred Scriptures*—a subject confessedly of the first importance at all times, but especially so at this moment at Geneva, as well as in some other portions of the Christian world, where the multiform errors of German neology are striving to estab-

lish themselves, or are strenuously resisting the efforts which are making to dislodge them. The following extract from the Preface of Professor Gaussen's work will at once explain the title which he has chosen, and the importance, in his view, of the subject.

At the first glance at this book and its title, two prejudices, equally erroneous, may arise in some minds, which I desire to dissipate.

The Greek term, *Theopneustia*, although borrowed from St. Paul, and long employed on the other side of the Rhine, being but little employed in our language, more than one reader, without doubt, will say of the subject herein treated, that it is too scientific to be popular, and too little popular to be important. I fear not, however, to declare that if any thing could have given me both the desire and the courage to undertake it, it is the double persuasion of its vital importance and its simplicity.

I do not think that, next to the divine nature of Christianity, any question can be presented to us more essential to the life of our faith than this: "The Bible, is it from God? Is it wholly from God? Or is it true, (as some have pretended,) that it contains sentences which are purely human, narratives which are not exact, instances of vulgar ignorance, and reasonings which are inconclusive; in a word, some books, or some portions of a book, foreign to the interests of faith, subject to the natural carelessness of the writer, and tainted by error?" Question decisive, fundamental, vital! It is the first which you have to make when you open the Scriptures; and it is with it that your religion ought to commence.

If it be true, in your opinion, that every thing in the Bible is not important, does not concern the faith, and has no reference to Jesus Christ,—and if it be true, in your opinion, on the other hand, that there is nothing inspired in this book but that which, in your opinion, is important to the interests of faith, and has reference to Jesus Christ, then your Bible is a book wholly different from that of the Fathers, of the Reformers, and of the saints of all ages. It is fallible; theirs was perfect. It has chapters, or portions of chapters, it has sentences or expressions, which are to be retrenched from the number of the chapters, sentences or expressions which are from God. Theirs was "all inspired of God;" "all profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works." The same passage, therefore, may, when contemplated by you, be as widely different from what it was, as contemplated then, as the earth is distant from the heavens.

We may have opened, for example, at the 45th Psalm, or at the Song of Songs. Whilst you have seen there nothing but what is in the greatest degree human in its character,—a long nuptial song, or the love-conversations of a daughter of Sharon and a young husband,—they have read there the glories of the church, the bonds of the love of God, the deep things of Jesus Christ; in a word, that which is most divine in the things of heaven; and if they could not read them there, they knew that they were there, and they searched for them there.

We may have taken up an epistle of St. Paul. Whilst one of us will attribute such and such a saying which he has not comprehended, or which has shocked his carnal sense, to the Jewish prejudices of the writer, to sentiments wholly appertaining to the vulgar, to circumstances altogether human, the other will there explore, filled with veneration, the thoughts of the Spirit ; he will believe them to be perfect, even before having comprehended them ; and he will attribute to his own want of apprehension, and his own ignorance, their apparent insignificance, or their obscurity.

Thus whilst in the Bible of the one every thing has its end, its place, its beauty, its use, as in a tree there are branches and leaves, vessels and fibres, epidermis and bark ; the Bible of the other is a tree which has leaves and branches, fibres and bark which God has not made.

But still further : not only, according to your answer, we shall have two Bibles, but it will not be possible to know what yours is. It is only human and fallible, you say, in a certain measure. But that measure,—who shall define it ? If it be true that man, in having placed in it his sad impress, has left there his spots, who will determine the depth of that impress, or the number of those spots ? It has a part which is human, you say ; but that part—what are its limits, and who will fix them for me ? No one. Each one must define them for himself, according to his own judgment ; that is, the portion of the Scriptures which is fallible will be greater in our estimation, in proportion as we are less under the influence of a divine illumination ; that is to say, again, that man will deprive himself of the words that are divine in proportion as he has need of them, as we see idolaters make to themselves deities so much the more impure as they themselves are further removed from the living and holy God ! So then, each one will reduce the inspired Scriptures to different dimensions, and making for himself, from the Bible thus expurgated, an infallible rule or guide, he will say to it “ Guide me henceforth, for thou art my guide ! ” as the makers of graven images, of whom Isaiah speaks, “ who make to themselves a god, and say to it : Save me henceforth, for thou art my God ! ” Is. 44, 17.

But this is not all ; there is something more grave still. According to your answer, it is not only the Bible that is changed ; it is you yourself ! Yes, even in the presence of the passages which you have most admired, you will have neither the attitude nor the heart of a believer ! How can that be, after you have made them appear, as you have the rest of the Scriptures, before the tribunal of your judgment, to be there declared, by you, divine or not divine, or half-divine ? What can be, for your soul, the authority of a word which is not infallible for you but in virtue of you ? Must it not have presented itself at your bar by the side of other words of the same book which you have convicted of being human in whole or in part ? Will your mind, then, sincerely take before it the humble and submissive attitude of a disciple, after having held that of a judge ? That is impossible. The obedience which you will render it may be that of acquiescence, never that of faith : of approbation, never that of adoration ! You will believe in the divinity of the passage, you will say ; but it is not in God that you will believe ; it is in yourself ! That word pleases you, but it does not govern you ; its authority over

you is admitted, but it does not reign over you ; it is before you as a lamp, but it is not in you as an unction from on high, a principle of light, a fountain of life ! I do not believe that any Pope, even the most enamored with his priesthood, could with confidence utter his prayers before a dead person whom he himself, from the abundance of his plenary authority, had placed in the rank of demi-gods, by canonizing him. How then can a reader of the Bible, who has himself just canonized a sentence of the Scriptures, (however much he may be enamored with his own wisdom) be in respect to such a passage, in the disposition of a believer ? Will his understanding descend from its pontifical chair, to abase itself before that word, which, were it not for it, would remain human, or at least doubtful ? We do not study to the bottom the sense of a passage, when we have pronounced it legitimate, only in virtue of a sense already discovered. We but half submit to any authority which we can reject, and which we have placed in doubt. We adore but imperfectly that which we have degraded.

Moreover,—and let us beware of it,—the entire divinity of such or such a word of the Scriptures being dependent, in your eyes, not from the fact that it is found in the oracles of God, but from its presenting to your wisdom and your spirituality, certain characters of spirituality and of wisdom, the opinion which you form cannot always be so exempt from hesitation that you should retain in relation to it none of the doubts with which you commenced. Your faith will, therefore, necessarily partake of your doubts, and it will be itself imperfect, undecided and conditional ! Like opinion, like faith ; and like faith, like life ! But faith is not there ; the life of God's elect is not there !

But that which will better demonstrate the importance of the question which is about to occupy us is the fact, that, if one of the two systems to which it may give existence has, as we have said, all its roots steeped in doubt, it brings forth inevitably as fruit, a new incredulity. Why is it that we see so many thousands of men open the Bible, morning and evening, without ever perceiving the doctrines which it teaches with the greatest clearness ? Whence comes it that they can thus walk in error, for so many years, with the sun as it were in their hands ? Yes ; but preoccupied by false notions on the subject of inspiration, and believing that there exists still in the Sacred Scriptures some admixture of error, but desirous, however, to be able to find some sentences which are in their opinion reasonable, in order to be able to believe them divine, they study, even without being conscious of it, to give to them a meaning which agrees with their own wisdom. And thus it is, that they only put themselves in a state of incapacity for recognizing what is God's meaning, but what they represent to themselves as despicable. They strive, for example, when reading the epistles of St. Paul, to find in them the doctrine of man's justification by the law, his native innocence, his inclination to what is good, the moral omnipotence of his will, the merit of his works. But then, what happens ? Alas ! After they have attributed, by violence, some such thoughts to the sacred writer, they find a language so badly conceived for the supposed end, terms so badly chosen for that which they wish to say, and reasonings so inconclusive, that they lose, in despite of themselves, whatever of respect they may still have preserved for the letter of the Sacred Scrip-

tures, and bury themselves in Rationalism. It is thus that having commenced in incredulity, they have gained, as the fruit, another incredulity; darkness in recompense for darkness; and they have fulfilled that dreadful word of Christ: "From him who has not shall be taken away even that which he thinketh that he has."

Such is then the fundamental importance of the great question which is about to occupy our attention. According to the answer which you have made to it, has the arm of the word of the Lord been weakened for you; the sword of the Spirit has been blunted; it has lost its temper and its incisive power. How could it from thenceforth penetrate even to the "joints and the marrow?" How could it be powerful against your lusts, your doubts, the world and Satan? How could it give you light, strength, victory, peace? No! It might indeed be that through the pure grace of God, and notwithstanding the unhappy state of the soul, one divine word might suddenly arrest it; then Zaccheus descends from the sycamore; Matthew quits the custom-house; the paralytic takes up his bed and walks; the dead arises. That may happen without doubt. But it remains not the less true, that the disposition of mind which judges the Scriptures, and doubts, in advance, of their universal inspiration, is one of the greatest obstacles which we can oppose to their action. "The word preached," says Paul (Heb. 4: 2), "did not profit them, not being mixed with faith in those who heard it;" whilst the most abundant benedictions of the same Scriptures have always been the inheritance of those souls which have received it, "not as the word of man, but (as it is in truth) as the word of God, which effectually worketh in those who believe." 1 Thess. 2: 13.

We see, then, that this question is one of immense gravity for the life of our faith; and we are right in saying that between the two answers which may be made to it, there is the same abyss which separated the two Israelites who had seen Jesus Christ in the flesh, and who had equally recognized him as a prophet. But whilst one of them, considering his carpenter's dress, his mean food, his hands rendered hard by labor, and his rustic suite, believed him to be still liable to error and to sin, as an ordinary prophet; the other recognized in him the Emmanuel, the Lamb of God, the Lord our Righteousness, the Holy One of Israel, the King of kings, the Lord of lords." Preface, pp. 1—7.

This extract, though long, will be received with interest by our readers. It gives a very clear and just idea of the importance of the subject, and the necessity of having correct and well established views of it.

In the first chapter of the work, Professor Gaussen gives us some account of the word *θεοπνευστία*:

It is, the name of that mysterious power which the Holy Spirit exercised upon the writers of the Old and New Testaments, to cause them to compose them such as the Church of God has received them from their hands. "All Scripture," says an apostle, "is *θεόπνευστος*,"—inspired of God.

He then proceeds to tell us in what this Theopneustia—this Inspiration of God—consists :

Theopneustia is not a system, it is a fact. Like all the other events in the history of Redemption, this fact, attested by the Holy Scriptures, is one of the dogmas of our faith. Nevertheless it is necessary to say, and it is necessary to understand, that this miraculous operation of the Holy Spirit had not the sacred writers for its object, who were but instruments, and who must soon pass away. But it had for its object the Sacred Books themselves, which were destined to reveal, from age to age, to the church the counsels of God, and which must endure forever.

The power which was exercised over these men of God, and which they did not themselves feel but in very different measures, has not been defined to us. Nothing authorizes us to explain it. The Scripture never presents to us the mode or the measure of it as an object of study. It only speaks incidentally of these things, and which do not concern our piety. That which it (the Scripture) proposes to our faith, is solely the inspiration of its words, the divine nature of the books which the writers have written. It has established, in this respect, no difference between them. Their words, it tells us, are *Theopneustic*—inspired of God ; their books are of God, whether they recite the mysteries of a past more ancient than the creation, or those of a future more distant than the return of the Son of Man, or the eternal councils of the Most High, or the secrets of the human heart, or the deep things of God : whether they recount their own emotions, or relate their recollections, or repeat contemporaneous narratives, or copy genealogies, or make extracts from uninspired documents,—their writings are inspired ; their recitals are directed from on high : it is always God who speaks, who recites, commands or reveals by their mouth, and who, to do this, employs, in different measures, their personality. For “the Spirit of the Lord was upon them,” it is written, “and this word was upon their tongue.” And if it is always the word of man, because it is always men who utter it, it is also the word of God, because it is God who watches over them, who employs them, who guides them. They give us their narrations, their doctrines, or their commandments, “not with the words which man’s wisdom teacheth, but with the words which the Holy Ghost teacheth ;” and thus it is that God himself is not only the guaranty of all these facts, but he is also the author of all these commandments, and the revealer of these truths. Still more ; he has caused them to be given to his church in the order, and in the measure, and in the terms which he has judged to be most suitable for his heavenly design.

If then we should be asked how this work of inspiration was accomplished in the men of God, we would reply that we do not know, that we need not know ; and that it is in the same ignorance, and with altogether a similar faith, we receive the doctrine of regeneration, or that of sanctification of a soul by the Holy Spirit. We believe that the Spirit enlightens the soul, purifies it, elevates it, fills it with consolation, melts it : we recognize all these effects ; we know and adore their Cause ; but we must be content to be forever ignorant of the means by which they are accomplished. Let it also be so with the doctrine of Theopneustia.

If we were asked, again, to say at least what the men of God experienced in their organs, in their will, or in their intelligence, whilst they were tracing the pages of the sacred volume, we should answer that the power or influence of inspiration was not felt to the same degree by each of them, and that their experiences were not uniform; but we would add that the knowledge of such a fact hardly concerns the interests of our faith, because it (our faith) is concerned in the book, and not the author. It is the book which is inspired, and which is wholly inspired. This assurance ought to satisfy us. pp. 2-5.

Our readers will by this time have obtained a pretty good idea of Professor Gaussen's view of the nature of Inspiration. It will have been perceived that he holds the doctrine of a minute and entire inspiration; an inspiration which relates to the very words and style of the writers of the Bible, as well as to the facts, the doctrines, etc., which their writings contain.

According to our author there are three classes of persons, who, without disavowing the divinity of the Scriptures, and without pretending to decline their authority, nevertheless believe that they are allowed to reject this doctrine. One class is composed of those who deny the *existence* of this action of the Holy Spirit; the second class, its *universality*; and the third, its *plenitude*.

The first, as Schleiermacher,* De Wette, and many other German theologians,† reject all miraculous inspiration, and are willing to attribute to the sacred writers only what Cicero allowed to the poets—*afflatus spiritus divini*—"a divine action of nature, an interior power similar to the other vital forces of nature.

The second, as Michaelis,‡ and as formerly Theodore of Mopsuestia, whilst they admit the existence of a divine inspiration, are willing to acknowledge it only in a portion of the sacred books;—in the first and the fourth of the four Gospels, for example, in a portion of the Epistles, in a portion of the writings of Moses, in a part of Isaiah, a part of Daniel. These portions of the Scriptures are from God; the others are from man.

The third, as Twisten in Germany, and as several theologians in England,§ extend, it is true, to all the parts of the Bible, the notion of a divine inspiration,—but *not equally to all*. Inspiration, according to them, may be universal, but unequal, often imperfect, accompanied with innocent errors, and carried, according to the nature of the passages, to very different measures, of which they constitute themselves more or less the judges. pp. 6, 7.

* Schleiermacher, *Der christliche Glaube*. Band. 1. p. 115.

† De Wette: *Lehrbuch Anmerk.* Twisten: *Vorlesungen über Die Dogmatik*, Bd. 1. p. 424, etc.

‡ Michaelis, *Introd. to the N. T.*

§ Dr. John Pye Smith, Daniel Wilson (now Bishop of Calcutta), Dick, &c.

Professor Gaussen rejects utterly, and with good reason, as we think, the distinctions which some English authors—and Dr. Dick among them, if we remember rightly—have made in the nature and degree of inspiration, calling one the inspiration of *superintendence*, another that of *elevation*, a third that of *direction*, and a fourth, that of *suggestion*. These distinctions are wholly fanciful. Such, too, is the distinction which Twes-ten makes when he says that “inspiration extends, without contradiction, even to the words, but only when their choice, or their employment, is connected with the interior religious life ; for it is necessary,” he adds, “to make a distinction between the Old and the New Testaments, between the law and the gospel, between the history and the prophecy, between the narrations and the doctrines, between the apostles and the helpers of the apostles.”

Our object is, (says Professor Gaussen, in another place) in this book—in opposition to all these three systems,—to prove the existence, the universality, and the plenitude of divine inspiration. In other terms, our object is to establish the truth, by the Word of God,—that the Scriptures are from God—that the Scriptures are, in all their parts, from God—and that the Scriptures, in all their parts, are entirely from God. p. 9.

Such are the doctrines which our author holds on this important subject, and which he undertakes to establish *from the Scriptures themselves*.

In maintaining, however, that the Scriptures are wholly from God, Professor Gaussen is far from thinking that the agency of man was nothing. In one sense, all the words of the Bible are from God ; in another sense they are from man. Pascal might have dictated one of his Provincial Letters to an artisan of Clermont, and another to the abbess of Port Royal. Would the former have been less the production of Pascal than the latter ? The great Newton might have dictated to a child at Cambridge the fortieth, and to a servant the forty-first proposition in his immortal *Principia* ; whilst he might have dictated other pages to Barrow or Whiston. Should we have possessed, if he had done so, discoveries which are less Newtonian ? Or the entire work, would it have been less his own ? It might be a curious question to ascertain what might have been the emotions of these various amanuenses of the great philosopher. The child and the servant may have had not one just conception of any thing which they wrote, as the language was Latin ;

whilst the learned Barrow and Whiston might have been carried away with rapture by the genius of their friend, as the young eagles on the wings of their parent, into the regions of boundless space. Yet there might have been lines which not even Barrow and Whiston fully comprehended. But what of it? This has nothing to do with the truth of the immortal work. Every one, who can, will say: "I will read the book for myself; its preface, its title, its first line, its last line,—all its theorems, whether easy or difficult, comprehended or not comprehended, are of the same author, and that is enough for me." Such is the fact in relation to Theopneustia.

God, intending to cause his elect to know, from an eternal book, the principles of the divine philosophy, dictated its pages, during sixteen hundred years, to priests, to kings, to warriors, to shepherds, to tax-gatherers, to fishermen, to scribes, to tent-makers. And yet the first line, the middle line, the last line, the whole and every part of this book are from the same eternal Source, the same infinite Mind. Whoever were the writers, and whatever their relative intelligence, they all wrote with the same faithful and guided hand, under the dictation of the same Master, with whom a thousand years are as one day. Such is the origin of the Bible. It is the word of Moses, the word of Amos, the word of John, the word of Paul; but the thoughts are of God, and it is the Word of God. It is wrong, therefore, to say that some passages or some verses are of man, and others of God. No: all the passages and all the verses, without exception, are of man; and all the passages and all the verses, without exception, are of God; whether he speaks directly in his own name, or employs the personality of the sacred writer. Inspiration is like efficacious grace. Under both influences—which are only operations of the same Spirit—man is, in different aspects, considered as wholly active and wholly passive. God does all, and man does all. In both it may be truly said: It is God who worketh in man to *will* and to *do*. Thus we see in the Scriptures, the same operations ascribed alternately to God and to man; God converts, and it is man who converts himself; God circumcises the heart, God gives a new heart, and it is man who is commanded to circumcise his heart, and to make to himself a new heart. "Not only because we ought to employ the means to obtain such an effect," says President Edwards, "but because the effect itself is our act

as well as our duty: *God producing all, and we doing all.*"*

Such is, then, the word of God. It is God speaking in man, God speaking by man, God speaking as man, God speaking for man!—This is what Professor Gaussen affirms; this is what he undertakes to prove.

It is possible to conceive that a religion might be divine, without the books in which it is taught being miraculously or really inspired. If such were the case in relation to Christianity, we should then have this astonishing fact to account for, that God devised the whole plan of salvation, announced it from time to time, during four thousand years, by his holy prophets, sent his Son at length to die on the cross for our sins, and sent forth his apostles to preach the story of redemption; and yet permitted them, as well as the Old Testament authors, to trust only to their own unaided powers, in committing the history of the Saviour's words and deeds, together with the revelations which were made to them, to writing, for the benefit and for the guidance of the Church in faith and practice, in all future time! This is altogether incredible. And why resort to such a theory? What help does it give? Is there more difficulty in believing that the authors of the Scriptures were inspired in writing them, than that they were inspired or divinely illumined in receiving the communications which these Scriptures record? If the writers of the sacred oracles were not inspired, they were liable to make the greatest mistakes, and to be plunged into the greatest uncertainties. We could not give their writings a greater authority than we do to those of St. Bernard, St. Augustine, Calvin, or Luther. We all know how many and what serious errors appear on the pages of these great men. And yet the apostles and other writers of the sacred Scriptures must have been exposed to fall into greater, if they were not guided by the unerring inspiration of God. For they had not, as the great men we have just named, a divine standard by which to measure their writings, neither had they the terminology of the science of religion already made for their use. To what errors, then, were they not exposed;—errors in the choice of facts; errors in their appreciation, errors in their exposition; errors in the conception of the

* Edwards' Remarks against the Arminians.

relations between the facts and the doctrines; errors even in the expression of these doctrines; errors of omission; errors of language; errors of exaggeration; errors from the prejudices of their nation, or of a party; errors in their precognition of the future as well as in their judgment of the past! But thanks be to God, it is not so with the sacred volume. It contains no error; it is wholly inspired of God. Its authors wrote as they were moved of God; they employed, not the words which man's wisdom teaches, but such as the Holy Ghost taught them. So that what they have written is the Word of God, and is pure "as silver refined by the fire;" and the whole and every part, every line, every word, is worthy of our respect and of our deepest study.

The definition, which Professor Gaussen gives of Theopneustia, is that it is *that inexplicable power which the Holy Spirit exercised in former times, on the Authors of the Sacred Scriptures, to guide them, even in the employment of the words which they used, and to preserve them from all error, and also from all omission.* In establishing the truth of the proposition, or rather of the propositions contained in this definition, the author relies upon the Scriptures themselves. In this, we think, he pursues the only truly satisfactory course. The inspiration of the Scriptures, in our opinion, can in no other way be conclusively demonstrated. To argue this question *a priori*,—to attempt to demonstrate the necessity of this miracle for the security of our faith, would be to argue it feebly, though it might enable us to say many fine things. To argue it from their beauty, their wisdom, their prophetic character, or from all the other traits of divinity which they reveal, would be to employ sound reasoning, without doubt, but such as is contestable, or at least has been, and constantly is, contested. It is to the Scriptures alone that we can go to determine this grand question. It is true that course, as Professor Gaussen justly remarks, will not satisfy the disciples of Porphyry, of Voltaire, of Jean Jacques Rousseau. But they are not, in reality, the persons addressed in a discussion of the inspiration of the Scriptures. It is only they who already believe the Scriptures to be true, who are in a state to be made to believe in their inspiration, and to pursue the train of argument proper to lead to thorough conviction on this point. As to those who do not believe the Scriptures to be true, they are to be dealt with in another manner. The arguments and facts, proper to establish

the claim of the Bible to contain a Revelation from God, are to be employed for this purpose. And when once a man has been brought to recognize them as valid, it is then for him to learn from the Bible what it is; and when it says that it is inspired, it is for it to say *how* it is inspired, and to what degree.

To listen to some modern writers, we should be led to believe that the doctrine of the inspiration of the Scriptures is one of the most difficult and uncertain of all the dogmas of Christianity. But no doctrine, it seems to us, is more simple, or more clear, for minds which are, in humility and docility, submissive to the testimony of the Scriptures. The question may indeed be difficult for those who, like the Jewish Talmudists and Rabbis of the middle age, imagine various sorts of inspiration, and who make learned distinctions on the subject, which are not only unknown to the Scriptures themselves, but also to the Church during the first eight centuries.*

In the prosecution of his work, Professor Gaussen first takes up and discusses the difficulties and objections which the doctrine which he maintains encounters; this he does at great length in the 2d Chapter of his book. Next, he treats of the evasions of this doctrine, which are held by some who yet profess to believe the Scriptures to be inspired: this he also does at great length in the 3d Chapter. In the 4th Chapter, he discusses the use of Sacred Criticism in its relations with Inspiration. The 5th Chapter treats the subject in a didactic manner, and discusses it under several very important aspects. Having thus cleared the ground, the Professor then gives us, in the 6th Chapter, the Scriptural proofs of the truth of the doctrine. And finally, he gives in the 7th and last Chapter, some summary views of the subject, and appropriate exhortations, addressed to all who may read his work, and which are well calculated to inspire them with a higher estimation of the Sacred Oracles, and consequently with a deeper sense of the importance of a most careful and unintermitted study of them.

We will devote the remaining portion of this article to a

* See on this subject the learned dissertation of Dr. Rudelbach, in which the author establishes, by history, the sound doctrines on Inspiration which Professor Gaussen endeavors to establish by the Scriptures.—*Zeitschrift für die gesammte Lutherische Theologie und Kirche, von Rudelbach und Guericke*, 1840.

very cursory notice of the work of our author, in the order which he has pursued, and which we have just indicated.

Having set forth the importance, as well as the nature, of the true doctrine of Inspiration, in the 1st Chapter, Professor Gaussen proceeds, as we have said, to examine in the 2d the objections which have been made to it. These objections are derived from various sources: *The Individuality of the Authors, profoundly imprinted on their books; Translations; Employment of the version of the Septuagint; Variations; Errors of reasoning, or of doctrine; Errors in the narratives, contradictions in the facts; Errors which oppose the philosophy of Nature; the Avowals of St. Paul.* All of these important points are discussed in a most masterly and most satisfactory manner. About thirty pages are devoted to answering the objections which are derived from the impression of the characters of their authors which the several sacred books bear. But we can only take one or two paragraphs as a specimen of the replies which our author makes to them.

Moreover that which most clearly shows the error of the objection to which we reply, is the extreme inconsistency which one finds in the way in which it is employed. In fact, to disprove the full inspiration of certain portions of the Scriptures, men have alleged the individuality with which they are stamped; and yet they admit that other portions of the sacred books, where this character equally occurs, must have been given directly from God, even in their lesser details. Isaiah, Daniel, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the author of the Apocalypse have impressed their style, their traits, their manner, in a word, their mark on their prophecies, as well as Luke, Mark, John, Paul and Peter have impressed theirs on their histories, or on their letters. The objection is, therefore, not valid; if it proves any thing, it proves too much.

Again, that which strikes us in this objection, and in the system of *intermittent* inspiration, with which it is associated, is its triple character of complication, of temerity and of puerility. Of complication: for it supposes that the divine action, in dictating the Scriptures, becomes interrupted or enfeebled, as often as the degree of difficulty of the passage, or the degree of its importance diminishes; and it is thus that God is made successively to advance or retire, in the mind of the sacred writer, in the course of even one chapter, or of even one passage! Of temerity: for, mistaking the majesty of the Scriptures, men dare to suppose that they have importance, and demand a wisdom more than human, only in certain parts. Of puerility: for they fear, they tell us, to attribute to God useless miracles: as if the Holy Spirit, after having, as they avow, dictated word for word one part of the Scriptures, must have found less trouble in illumining the sacred writer, then leaving him to write alone, or in having a superintendence over him. pp. 34, 35.

As to the objection against the plenary inspiration of the original Scriptures, which has been drawn from the fact that the translations which are made from them are not inspired, Professor Gaussen rightly considers it as unworthy of the name of an objection. Yet he shows most conclusively how important it is that the Scriptures in the Hebrew and Greek originals should be inspired, and consequently free from error, even though almost the entire Christian world must of necessity use translations made by uninspired men.

From the remarks of our author on the objection which is made against the complete inspiration of the Scriptures, from the manner in which the writers of the New Testament have quoted from the Septuagint, we give one paragraph, which annihilates this objection, in the most summary and conclusive manner possible.

If some modern prophet were sent from God to the churches which speak our language, how do you think that such a man would quote the Scriptures? In French, without doubt; but according to what version? Those of Ostervald and Martin being the most extensively used, it is probable that he would make his citations in the terms of one or the other, as often as their translations might seem to him to be sufficiently exact. But also, notwithstanding our practice and his, he would take great care to leave both of these versions, and translate after his own way, as often as it might appear to him that the meaning of the original was not sufficiently well rendered in them. Sometimes, even, he would do more. To make us better comprehend in what sense he might have the intention to apply such or such a scripture, he would paraphrase the alleged passage, and then he would follow, in citing it, neither the letter of the original text, nor that of the translations. It is precisely thus that the writers of the New Testament have done in relation to the Septuagint. p. 60.

In the 4th section of this chapter, the author treats the question of the variations which are found in the original text of the Scriptures; and although it does not touch the question of the plenary and verbal inspiration of the original text to allege that there are variations in early manuscripts and versions, yet Professor Gaussen devotes nearly forty pages to this subject, and gives a summary of the remarkable results to which long-continued and most extensive and faithful investigations on the part of Mill, Griesbach, Rossi, Kennicott, Bengel, Scholz and others have led.

In the 5th section he treats the objection against the inspiration of the Scriptures, which some have founded on the appa-

rent instances of bad reasoning, inapplicable quotations, popular superstitions, prejudices, and other weaknesses which they allege to be found in the Scriptures. The answer which our author makes to all this is of a very general nature, and is perhaps as good as could be given to such vague accusations, without going into a minute examination of all such instances,—which would require a volume.

Under section 6th of this chapter, the author devotes thirty pages to the consideration of the alleged *Errors in the Narratives*, and *Contradictions in the Facts* of the sacred Scriptures. Not only did Socinus, Castellion, and others of the same school, in the XVIth century, maintain the existence of such errors and contradictions, but, what is more astonishing, some very distinguished men of our own times—such as Dr. John Pye Smith, Daniel Wilson (now Bishop of Calcutta), and Twisten of Berlin—have admitted the same thing. Professor Gaussen replies with great ability to the positions taken by these authors, and maintains that no such errors or contradictions exist in the Scriptures, when rightly translated. He goes into a minute examination of a large number of the most important instances of errors and contradictions which have been alleged, and certainly maintains with success the ground which he holds on this point. Our limits will not suffer us to follow him in the examination which he makes of these cases. They are such as the apparent contradictions which exist in the different accounts given by the evangelists respecting the resurrection of the Saviour; the blind men of Jericho; the death of Judas Iscariot; various dates mentioned in the historical books of the Old Testament; the genealogies of Jesus Christ; the enrolment of the people mentioned in Luke 2: 1, 2; the contradictions which are found in 1 Cor. 15: 44, and Job 19: 26; the temptation of the Saviour as recorded by Matthew and Luke, &c. &c. All these alleged difficulties are treated in a most satisfactory manner, and it is conclusively demonstrated that they constitute no valid ground of objection to the doctrine of the plenary inspiration of the sacred volume.

In the same section, the author discusses the *Errors in the Sacred Scriptures, which, it is alleged, contradict the Laws of Nature*. This he does at length, and with much ability. Indeed this section is the most masterly view of this subject which we have ever seen. We have only one objection to make to it, and that relates to what the author says

respecting the miracle of the sun and the moon standing still at the command of Joshua. It was scarcely worth while to undertake to demonstrate mathematically how the earth might be made to cease revolving on its axis without causing "the belligerent armies," as the neological Professor Chenevière asserts, "and every thing which is on the surface of the soil, to be swept away like chaff by the tempest." The objection is too silly to merit a moment's notice. For, could not the same Almighty hand which caused the earth and the moon instantaneously to stop, also hold every thing, animate and inanimate, in its proper place on their surface, and that in so perfect a manner that not the slightest derangement should occur?

After having shown that, from the nature of the case, the language of the Scriptures in relation to the phenomena of Nature, must be accommodated to that which mankind in all ages have commonly used; and after having shown how inconvenient and incomprehensible sometimes, even to the genius of a Newton, the Bible must have been if it had always spoken of the operations of Nature, not as science has even yet ascertained them, but as they really are, the author proceeds to lay down his first position in relation to this subject, which is, *that there is not one physical error in the Word of God*. This point he discusses with singular felicity. From this part of his work we are tempted to give an extract of considerable length, which will well reward the reader for a careful perusal. After having, in the course of several pages, indicated the errors of both ancient and modern philosophers, on several points in Physics and Astronomy, as well as some of the ridiculous decisions of some of the Roman Pontiffs, such as Pope Zachariah, and the Holy Office (by which Galileo was condemned), he proceeds:

But now open the Bible; study its fifty sacred authors, from that admirable Moses who held the pen in the wilderness, four hundred years before the war of Troy, to that fisherman, son of Zebedee, who wrote fifteen hundred years later at Ephesus and in Patmos, under the reign of Domitian;—open the Bible, and see if you will find there any thing like this. No; none of those mistakes which the science of each succeeding age discovers in the books of the preceding; above all, none of those absurdities which modern astronomy indicates, in such great numbers, in the writings of the ancients,—in their sacred codes, in their philosophies, and even in the finest pages of the Fathers of the Church,—not one of these errors is to be found in any of our sacred books. Nothing there will ever contradict that which, after so many ages, the

investigations of the learned world have been able to reveal to us on the state of our globe, or on that of the heavens. Peruse, with care, our Scriptures from one end to the other, to find there such spots. And whilst you apply yourselves to this examination, remember that it is a book which speaks of every thing, which describes nature, which recounts its grandeur, which relates the story of its creation, which tells us of the formation of the heavens, of the light, of the water, of the atmosphere, of the mountains, of the animals and of the plants. It is a book which teaches us the first revolutions of the world, and which also foretells its last; it recounts them in the circumstantial language of history, it extols them in the sublimest strains of poetry, and it chants them in the charms of glowing song. It is a book which is full of oriental rapture, elevation, variety and boldness. It is a book which speaks of the heavenly and invisible world; whilst it also speaks of the earth and things visible. It is a book which nearly fifty writers, of every degree of cultivation, of every state, of every condition, and living through the course of fifteen hundred years, have concurred to make. It is a book which was written in the centre of Asia, in the sands of Arabia, and the deserts of Judah, in the courts of the temple of the Jews, in the rustic schools of the prophets of Bethel and of Jericho, in the sumptuous palaces of Babylon, and on the idolatrous banks of Chebar; and finally, in the centre of the western civilization, in the midst of the Jews and of their ignorance, in the midst of polytheism and its idols, as also in the bosom of pantheism and of its sad philosophy. It is a book whose first writer had been forty years a pupil of the magicians of Egypt, in whose opinion the sun, the stars and the elements were endowed with intelligence, reacted on the elements, and governed the world by a perpetual effluvium. It is a book whose first writer preceded, by more than nine hundred years, the most ancient philosophers of ancient Greece and Asia, the Thaleses and the Pythagorases, the Zaleucuses, the Xenophons and the Confuciuses. It is a book which carries its narrations even to the plains of the invisible world, even to the hierarchies of angels, even to the most distant epochs of the future, and the glorious scenes of the last day. Well; search among its 50 authors, search among its 66 books, its 1,189 chapters and its 34,173 verses, search for only one of those thousand errors which the ancients and the moderns commit when they speak of the heavens or of the earth; of their revolutions or of their elements; search,—but you will find none.

Its language is without constraint and without reserve. It speaks of every thing and in all tones. It is the prototype,—it has been the unrivalled model, and the inspirer of all that is most elevated in poetry. Ask Milton, ask the Racines, ask Young, ask Klopstock. They will tell you, that this divine poetry is, of all, the most lyrical, the boldest and the most sublime. It mounts on the wings of a seraph, it expatiates on those of the wind. And yet this book never does violence either to the facts or to the principles of a sound philosophy of nature. You never find it in opposition, even in one sentence, to the just notions which science has conveyed to us on the form of our globe, on its size and its geology; on the void and on space; on the inert and passive materiality of all the stars; on the planets, on their masses, on their courses, on their dimensions, or on their influences; on the stars which

inhabit the profundities of space, on their number, on their nature, on their immensity. In like manner, when speaking of the invisible world, and of the subject—so new, so unknown, so delicate—of the angels, this book will not present you one of its writers, in the course of the 1560 years, which were employed in writing it, who has differed from the others in the character which he gives of the love, of the humility, of the fervor, and of the purity, which belongs to those mysterious beings. In like manner, in speaking of the relations of the heavenly world to God, never has one of these fifty writers, either in the Old Testament or in the New, uttered a single word favorable to the perpetual pantheism of the heathen philosophy. Neither do you find one of the authors of the Bible who, in speaking of the visible world, has suffered to escape from his pen one of those sentences which in other books contradict the reality of facts; not one which makes of the heavens a *firmament*, as do the Septuagint, St. Jerome and all the Fathers of the Church;* no one who makes the world to be an intelligent animal, as Plato does; no one who reduces all things here below, to the four physical elements of the ancients; no one who thinks with the Jews, with the Greeks and the Romans, with the best geniuses of antiquity,—with the great Tacitus among the ancients, and the great De Thou† among the moderns,—with the skeptical Montaigne, “that the stars have rule and power, not only over our lives, and the conditions of our fortune, but even over our inclinations, our discourse, our wills; that they rule them, impel and agitate them at the mercy of their influences; and that (as far as our reason teaches and discovers) the entire of this lower world is moved at the least shaking of the least of the heavenly movements. *Facta etenim et vitas hominum suspendit ab astris.*”‡ No one who speaks of the mountains as Mohammed does; of the cosmogony as Buffon; of the antipodes as Lucretius, as Plutarch, as Pliny, as Lactantius, as St. Augustine, as Pope Zachariah. Certainly, if only one of these errors which abound in the writings of philosophers, both ancient and modern, could be found in the Bible, our faith in the plenary inspiration of the Scriptures would be more than compromised; it would be necessary to acknowledge that there are errors in the Word of God, and that these false sentences belong to a fallible writer and not to the Holy Spirit; for God is not man that he should lie; in him there is no variableness, nor shadow of falsehood; and He to whom “lying lips are an abomination,” cannot contradict himself, nor dictate that which is false.

There is, then, no physical error in the Scriptures, and this great fact, which becomes the more wonderful in proportion as it is viewed from a position near at hand, is a striking proof of the inspiration which dictated them, even in the choice of their least expressions.

But still more;—here is a second fact. Not only does the Bible not contain a false sentence, or a false expression, but it often allows to escape words which make us recognize, in a manner not to be misunderstood, the science of the Almighty. Its great object, without doubt, was to reveal to us the eternal grandeurs of the invisible world, and not

* As the authors of our authorized English version have also done.

† De Thou, or Tuanus, a distinguished French writer.

‡ Montaigne's Essays, Book II. ch. 12.

the barren secrets of that which is about to perish. Nevertheless it often happens, that its language, when listened to with attention, permits us to see a science which it will not teach, but which it cannot be ignorant of, *since there is in it a profound abyss*. Not only will it tell us nothing false, even in passing, but it often surprises us with words which betray the voice of the Creator of the world. Often you remark in them a wisdom, a prudence, an exactitude, of which the ages of antiquity could not form an idea, and which the discoveries alone of the telescope, and of the science of the moderns have been able to appreciate: so that its language carries, by these traits, the evident characteristics of the most entire inspiration. The discreet and unusual choice of its expressions, the nature of certain details, whose perfect propriety and divine adaptedness to the facts were only revealed three thousand years later, the reserve of the language, sometimes its boldness and its strangeness, considering the time when it was written,—all these signs make you know the Savant *par excellence*, the Ancient of Days, who addresses himself to his children without doubt, but who speaks as the Father of a family, and who well knows his house. pp. 166—173.

Want of space forbids our extracting the succeeding pages, in which the author illustrates the position which he assumes in the last paragraph which we have quoted, and shows how wonderfully the representations of the sacred writers agree with the discoveries of science, in regard to the shape of the globe, its rotundity, its resting on nothing; the epoch and the order of the several stages of the unravelling of the primitive chaos; the heaven, as being an *expanse* and not a *firmament*, or *στερέωμα*; the light, as being independent of the sun; the creation of plants; the atmosphere, as having *weight*; the nature of the clouds; the mountains; the exterior of the globe, as being a crust or shell; the interior, as composed of fire;* the surface of the earth, as emerging or rising out of the waters; the deluge, as having been caused by the internal heat, and its action on the crust of the earth; the creation of birds and fishes, as having the same origin, and similar characteristics;† the arresting of the *moon* as well as the sun, by miracle; the primitive unity of the language of mankind; the dimensions of the ark of Noah; the vast number of the stars, and their subjection to laws in their position and movements; the division of the heavens; and finally, the grandeur and immensity of creation. On all these subjects, the discoveries of

* Job 28: 5. *Literally*: Beneath, it is turned up, and as it were, of fire."

† See the Memoirs of Dr. J. L. Prevost, of Geneva.

modern science most remarkably confirm, as Professor Gaussen justly states and fully proves, the gleamings of light which the Scriptures, rightly translated, in no obscure manner, shed upon them.

In the 7th and last section of this chapter, the Professor considers and demolishes the objections against the plenary inspiration of the Scriptures, which have been founded upon what are called the *Avowals of St. Paul*. He shows conclusively that these avowals relate only to the cases in which the apostle had no express command from the Lord to give, thus leaving them among the things indifferent, and which might be done or not; but in which the Apostle sometimes ventures to give his *advice*. This militates in no way, however, against the true doctrine of the Inspiration of the Scriptures.

The third chapter, which is a long one, is devoted to the consideration of what the author terms *Evasions* of the true doctrine. These evasions are arranged under three heads. The first may be expressed thus: *Does the Inspiration of the sacred Scriptures concern only the thoughts, or does it extend also to the words of the writers?*

The second: *Ought the Historical Books of the Scriptures to be excepted from this plenary Inspiration?*

The third: *Does the apparent insignificance of certain details in the Bible authorize their exclusion from this Inspiration?*

These topics the Professor discusses in a very satisfactory manner, and maintains the plenary inspiration of the sacred volume throughout, in its words as well as in its ideas; in its minutest and apparently most trivial details, as well as in its most solemn and obviously important narratives. We give but one extract: it is from the portion of this chapter in which he discusses the second of the above stated topics.

Where will you find, among all the uninspired narrators, a man who has written any thing as St. Luke has written the Acts of the Apostles? Who has known how to recount in thirty pages the history of thirty of the most beautiful years of Christianity, from the ascension of the Son of Man to heaven, to the imprisonment of St. Paul in the capital of the Roman world? Incomparable History! See at once how short and how great it is! What do we not find in it? Discourses addressed to the Jews and to the Greeks,—pronounced before the tribunals, before the Areopagus and before the Sanhedrim, in the public places, and before a proconsul, in the synagogues and before kings; admirable descriptions of the primitive Church; miraculous and dramatic scenes in its bosom; interventions of angels to deliver, to warn, or to punish;

controversies and divisions in the assemblies of Christians ; new institutions in the Church ; the history of a first council and its synodic epistle ; commentaries on the Scriptures ; recitals of heresies ; solemn and terrible judgments of God ; appearances of the Lord in the way, in the temple, in the prison ; detailed conversions and such as were often miraculous, and singularly various,—that of Eneas, that of the eunuch, that of Cornelius the centurion, that of the Roman jailer, that of the proconsul, that of Lydia, that of Apollos, that of many people at Jerusalem ;—not to speak of those which were only commenced, such as the emotions of king Agrippa, the agitation of Felix, the professions of Simon of Samaria, the anguish of Pilate's wife, and the benevolence of the captain Julius ;—missionary journeys ; lasting divisions among Christians of different classes, respecting things external ; mutual prejudices ; different solutions of cases of conscience ; disputes between brethren and even between apostles ; the developments, the explanations and the triumphs of the spirit of charity ; communications from one military officer to another, from proconsul to proconsul ; revelations made to the churches respecting the calling of the Gentiles ; collections made by the poor of one church for the benefit of another ; prophecies ; national scenes ; punishments either perpetrated or designed ; summons before Jewish tribunals or Roman municipal authorities, before governors and kings ; Christian assemblies from house to house,—their emotions, their prayers, their charity, their doubts and fears ; a persecuting king struck by an angel and eaten of worms, at the moment, when, to please the populace, he had accomplished the death of one apostle and had designed that of another ; persecutions under all forms, by the synagogues, by the princes, by the Jews, and by popular tumults ; deliverances of the men of God, one while by a child, another while by an angel, one while by a Roman tribune, or a captain of a ship, by pagan magistrates, or by idolatrous soldiers ; tempests, shipwrecks, with details which, by their nautical exactness (as we have seen), charm even the mariners of our days ;—and all this in thirty pages, or twenty-eight little chapters ! Admirable brevity ! Was there not need of the Holy Spirit of God for this conciseness, for this selection of details, for this pious, varied, brief, richly significant manner which employs so few words, and teaches so many things ? Fulness, conciseness, clearness, simplicity, elevation, practical richness,—such is the ecclesiastical history which the people of God needed. This is true ; but it is not thus that men narrate events.

Could you find on the earth a man that is capable of relating the assassination of his mother with the manifest calmness, the propriety, the sobriety, the coolness of the four-fold narrative of the Evangelists, recounting the death of Jesus ; of that Jesus whom they loved more than one loves his mother, more than one loves his life ? That Jesus whom they adored ; whom they had seen prostrate in Gethsemane, and afterwards betrayed, abandoned, dragged along, with his hands tied, into Jerusalem, and finally nailed, naked, to the cross, whilst the sun hid his light, the earth quaked, and He who had restored the dead to life was Himself reduced to the state of the dead ! Was there not need of the Spirit of God in each line, in each word of such a narration, to choose appropriately from an age, and from a world of reminiscences ?

It was necessary moreover that the sacred historians should be guided by the Spirit, in order that they should know how to maintain that divine prudence which not only reveals itself in that information which they give, but also in the reserve which they manifest, not only in the terms which they employ, but also in those which they shun.

And to give here some proof of this, see, for example, how they speak of the mother of Jesus. What divine foresight, what prophetic wisdom there is both in their narratives and in their expressions, How easy it would have been for them, in their ardent adoration of the son, to have expressed themselves too respectfully of the mother! Would not a single word, suffered to escape them through an imprudence so natural in their first emotions, have forever authorized the idolatry of the ages to come towards Mary, and the crime of the worship which has been rendered her? But that word they never uttered. Did they even once call her the Mother of God? No, not even that: although He was for them Emmanuel, the God-man, the Word which was in the beginning, which was with God, which was God, and which was made flesh. Listen to them. What do they say of her after the death and the resurrection of their Saviour? Only one sentence, after which they are silent, respecting her forever! "These all continued with one accord in prayer and supplication with the women, and Mary the mother of Jesus, and with his brethren." They do not name her there as the first or the last; she appears there as the mother of Jesus, among the brethren of Jesus and the women of Gallilee. And what do they say of her before the death of the Lord? Reflect upon it well; ah! it is not thus that men recount events! among all the words which Jesus Christ must have addressed to his mother, from the commencement of his public mission until its termination, they have reported to us but three sentences. Here is the first: "Woman, what have I to do with thee,"—or what is this to me and thee,—when she interfered in his ministry which had just commenced, and asked him to perform a miracle. Again, when a certain woman, from among the people, exclaimed in her ardent enthusiasm: "Blessed is the womb which bare thee and the paps which thou hast sucked," "Say," he replied, "Blessed rather are they who hear the word of God and keep it."—Listen now to the third; his mother and brethren had been shaken in their faith; they had listened to those who had said: "He is beside himself!" And some one came and told him: "Thy mother and thy brethren are without, who desire to see thee." "Who is my mother?" he replied. And stretching forth his hand towards his disciples, he said: "Behold my mother. . . . every woman who shall do the will of my Father who is in heaven is my mother."—And when, finally, he saw her, from the cross, he called her no more by the name of mother; but he bequeathed her to the disciple whom he loved, saying: "Woman, behold thy son: John, behold thy mother;" and from that hour that disciple received her into his house, not to adore her, but to protect her, as a feeble and suffering being, whose soul had been pierced as with a sword.

Is it thus, we ask again, that man relates events, and was there not need that the prophetic Spirit should be the narrator of all these facts? pp. 217—223.

Under the head of *Vulgar Details*, which constitutes the third section in this chapter, the author makes some beautiful remarks, to show that what are esteemed such details are most instructive portions of the Scriptures, when rightly studied.

The Fourth chapter is *on the use of Sacred Criticism, in its relation to Inspiration*. This topic is also discussed at very considerable length, and with much ability, in the compass of three sections, whose titles are as follows:

1. *Sacred Criticism a Servant, not a Judge.*
2. *Sacred Criticism a Historian, not a Diviner.*
3. *Sacred Criticism the porter (or door-keeper) of the Temple, and not its Divinity.*

The proper province of Sacred Criticism is very clearly and justly defined in this chapter.

Criticism (says our author) is a noble science. It is so in regard to its object—the study of the destinies of the sacred text, its canon, its manuscripts, its versions, its witnesses, the vast numbers of those who have cited it. It is so by reason of its services:—what triumphs obtained over infidelity, what objections reduced to silence, what wicked doubts dissipated forever!—It is so in regard to its history:—how many eminent men have consecrated to it either the devotion of a pious life, or the resources of the most beautiful genius! It is so, finally, by reason of its immense labors, of which no one can know the extent, unless he has studied it. God forbid that we should ever oppose faith to science;—the faith which lives by the truth, to the science which seeks for it! that faith which seeks for it (the truth) directly at the hand of God, to that science which seeks for it more indirectly elsewhere, and which often finds it! All that is true in one place is in pre-established harmony with that which is true in another and more elevated place. Faith, then, knows in advance, and before having seen any thing, that all truth will render testimony to it. If then all true science, whatever it may be, is the friend of faith, Sacred Criticism is more than a friend; she is almost a relative. But if she is honorable, useful, necessary, she is so only so long as she remains true, and keeps her proper place. So long as she does not quit the field which belongs to her, she is worthy of our respect; but from the moment she leaves it, it becomes necessary to restrain her; she is then no longer a science, but only a silly sooth-sayer.

We have no space for further extracts from this most interesting chapter. We pass on, therefore, to the next.

In chapter V. the author gives us what he terms a *Didactic Summary of the Doctrine of Inspiration*. After having given in the first section, a retrospective notice of what he has already advanced, in the preceding portions of his book, he devotes the entire second and remaining section, which extends through

nearly seventy pages, to an argumentative consideration of the subject of Inspiration. This he does to greater advantage from the fact that he had in the preceding chapters cleared the ground for it. In conducting this argument he employs the catechetical manner, and by propounding and answering no less than *forty-five* questions, which seem to cover the whole ground of argument, he discusses the subject under almost every possible aspect in which it can be considered by human reason. We give the reader some idea of the author's manner in this chapter, by extracting three or four of these questions, together with their answers:

XVI. May much evil result from the doctrine, according to which the language of inspiration is only the human expression of a superhuman revelation, and, so to speak, but the natural reflection of a supernatural illumination?

There will ever result from it these two evils: either men will degrade the oracles of God to a level with the words of saints; or they will elevate the latter to a level with the Scriptures. It is a baneful consequence, whose alternatives have been produced in all ages. It is inevitable. All men, truly regenerated, being enlightened by the Holy Spirit, it follows, according to this doctrine, that they all possess, although in different degrees, the element of inspiration; so that according to the arbitrary idea which you may have formed of their spiritual state, you will be inevitably led one while to assimilate the sacred writers to them, at another, to elevate them to the rank of men inspired from on high.

XVII. Can you cite religious bodies, in which the former of these evils have been realized; I mean to say, in which men have been carried to the length of reducing the Scriptures to the level of the words of saints?

All the systems of the Protestant Doctors who suppose that there is some mixture of error in the sacred Scriptures are founded upon this doctrine,—from Semler and Ammon, to Eichhorn, Paulus, Gabler, Schuster and Restig; from De Wette, to the more respectful systems of Michaelis, Rosenmüller, Scaliger, Capel, John Le Clerc and Vossius. According to these systems, the divine light, by which the intelligence of the sacred writers was enlightened, might experience certain partial eclipses, by the inevitable effect of their natural infirmities, of a defect of memory, of an innocent ignorance, of a popular prejudice; so that their writings have retained the traces of it, and we can recognize the places where the shadows have fallen!

XVIII. Can you cite also some religious bodies in which the latter evil has occurred; I mean to say, in which, by having confounded inspiration with illumination, men have elevated saints and doctors to the rank of inspired men?

We may, above all, cite the Jews and the Latins (or Roman Catholics).

XIX. What have the Jews done?

They have considered the Rabbis of the ages succeeding the Dispersion, as endowed with an infallibility which has placed them on a level with (if not above) Moses and the Prophets. They have attributed, without doubt, a sort of inspiration to the sacred Scriptures; but they have forbidden to explain the oracles of God, otherwise than according to their traditions. They have called the immense body of these "commandments of men" the *Oral Law*, the *Doctrine*, or the *Talmud*, distinguishing it into the *Mishna*, or *Second Law*, and the *Gemara*—*complement* or *perfection*. They have maintained that it was transmitted from God to Moses, from Moses to Joshua, from Joshua to the prophets, from the prophets to Ezra, from Ezra to the doctors of the Great Synagogue, and from them to the Rabbis *Antigonus*, *Soccho*, *Shemaia*, *Hillel*, *Schammai*; until at length *Judah the Holy* committed it to the *Traditions*, or *Repetitions* of the law, which, at a later day, together with their commentary or complement (the *Gemara*), have formed, at first, the *Talmud of Jerusalem*, and afterwards that of *Babylon*.

"One of the greatest obstacles which we meet among the Jews," says the Missionary *MacCaul*, "is their invincible prejudice in favor of their traditions and their commentaries; so that we cannot induce them to purchase our Bibles without notes or commentaries."* "The Law," say they, "is like salt; the Mishna, like pepper; the Talmuds, like aromatics." "The Scriptures are like water; the Mishna, like wine; and the Gemara like spiced-wine." "My son," says Rabbi Isaac, "learn to give more attention to the words of the scribes than to the words of the Law." "Turn your children," (said Rabbi Eleazer, on his death-bed, to his scholars who asked him respecting the way of life,) "turn your children from the study of the Bible, and place them at the feet of the wise men." "Learn, my son," says Rabbi Jacob, that the words of the scribes are more lovely than those of the prophets!;†

XX. And what has resulted from these enormities?

It has resulted, by this means, that millions and millions of immortal souls, though wandering throughout the earth, though weary and heavy-laden, though despised and persecuted in every place, have carried about with them, into every nation of the earth, the book of the Old Testament, intact and complete, and have not ceased to read it, in the Hebrew, every Sabbath, in thousands and thousands of synagogues, during eighteen hundred years; without, however, discovering in it that Jewish Messiah whom we all adore, and to know whom would be from this day forth their deliverance, as it must one day be their happiness and their glory! Full well said Jesus unto them; "Ye reject the commandment of God, that ye may keep your tradition."‡

XXI. And what have the Latins done?

They have considered the Fathers, the Popes, and the Councils of the successive ages of the Roman Church, as endowed with an infallibility which puts them on a level with (if not above) Jesus, the

* Letter from Warsaw, May 22d, 1827.

† Talmud of Jerusalem.

‡ Mark vii. 9, where the word *reject*, in the text, is better replaced by the word *frustrate*, in the margin of our English Bible.

prophets, and the apostles. They have, it is true, differed greatly, one from another, on the doctrine of the inspiration of the Scriptures; and the Faculties of Douay and Louvain, for example, resisted stoutly the opinion of the Jesuits, who were unwilling to recognize in the operation of the Holy Spirit, any thing more than a *direction* which preserved the sacred writers from error; but they have all forbidden to explain the sacred Scriptures otherwise than after the traditions. They have believed that they had the right to say, in all their Councils, as the apostles and prophets of Jerusalem: "*It hath seemed good to the Holy Spirit and to us.*" They have declared that it belonged to them to judge of the true sense of the Scriptures. They have called the immense body of these "commandments of men," *the Oral Law, the Unwritten Traditions, the Unwritten Law*. They have said that they were transmitted from God, and dictated by the mouth of Jesus Christ or the Holy Spirit, by a continued succession. pp. 321—326.

We have not room to give further extracts from this interesting chapter. What we have given will enable the reader to form some idea of the original and striking manner in which the subject is discussed in the Socratic style.

The Sixth chapter relates to the *Scriptural proof of the doctrine of Inspiration*, and is divided into the following sections:

1. *The whole Scripture is theopneustic, or inspired of God.*
2. *All the words of the Prophets were from God.*
3. *All the Scriptures of the Old Testament are prophetic.*
4. *All the words of the New Testament are prophetic.*
5. *The examples of the Apostles and of their Master attest that, in their estimation, all the words of the sacred Books were given from God.*

This chapter, we need hardly inform the reader, is the most important one in the book. It contains, in the course of more than seventy pages, a thorough examination of every passage of the Scriptures which has a bearing on this subject. We have extended this article too far already to allow us to give any extracts from it, and it is not possible to give an abridgment of it in a few pages. We can only say that we have read it with the greatest satisfaction, and are entirely convinced that it settles the question of the plenary inspiration of the Scriptures. At least for ourselves, we cannot well see how any thing more conclusive could be advanced. We have never seen the testimony of the Saviour to the inspiration of the books of the Old Testament, nor the promise of the infallible guidance of the Holy Spirit to his apostles so fully brought forward and made to bear on this subject, as is done in this chap-

ter, and no view of the question could be stronger or more convincing.

The Seventh and last chapter is made up of a summary, or general view of the whole subject, and appropriate counsels to the reader, on the necessity of having right views of this important doctrine, and of so reading the Scriptures as to hear in them, and through them, the voice of our Heavenly Father, addressing us in one way and another, in every line of the sacred volume.

We do not see how any man can rise from the careful perusal of Professor Gaussen's book without having a more profound reverence for the Bible; or without uttering the prayer: "Open thou mine eyes, that I may behold wondrous things in thy Law." Wonderful volume! in which truth is presented in a form adapted to every condition and capacity of the human mind;—"containing," as Desmarets says, "fords for the lambs, and "deep waters where the elephants may swim."

We do not agree with Professor Gaussen in all his positions—as for instance, on the point of the second coming of the Saviour to reign personally on the earth,—nor do we suppose that his book might not be made more compact, better arranged in some respects, and more simple in its phraseology. Some improvements of this sort might, there is no doubt, be made in it. But take it all in all, we think it decidedly the best work on the subject which we have ever read. There is nothing in the English language which is comparable to it, unless it be the excellent work of the Rev. Dr. Henderson. But even that is not so entirely satisfactory to our minds as is the work of Professor Gaussen. We think that he nobly maintains the true doctrine on the subject of the inspiration of the Scriptures. It is the ground which, as he justly observes, was held, almost without exception, by the entire church during the first eight centuries. It was the doctrine of the greatest and best of the Reformers, as well as the most distinguished theologians who have trodden in their footsteps. "The Holy Spirit," says the illustrious Claude,* "employed the pen of the evangelists and of the apostles, of Moses and the prophets; he furnished them with the occasions of writing; he gave the desire and strength for it; the matter, the order, the economy, the expressions are of his immediate inspiration and of his direction."

* Posthumous Works, Vol. IV. p. 228.

This sentence, from one of the brightest ornaments of the French Protestant Church, in a by-gone century, expresses, we apprehend, the truth on this subject.

We conclude this article with the expression of our sincere desire that Professor Gaussen will not permit his pen to remain long idle. There are many subjects, connected with the important department which he occupies in the new Theological Seminary at Geneva, which demand his attention and his labors. May he long live, in conjunction with his excellent colleagues, to render illustrious the Evangelical church of Geneva, and to recover for that city the glory which Farel, and Calvin, and Beza, and Francis Turretin and Pictet shed upon it in days of old.

A detailed history of the Progress, the Conflicts and Triumphs of the Truth, within the last twenty-five years, in that ancient city, where Pelagianism, Socinianism and Deism have so long prevailed, would make an interesting article for the Repository; and we think we may promise our readers that, with God's help, it shall before long be submitted to them.

ARTICLE V.

THE ANTEDILUVIAN CHRONOLOGY OF THE BIBLE.

*A Discourse delivered before the Royal Society of Göttingen,
July 5, 1768: by J. D. Michaelis.*

Translated from the Latin, by Stephen Chase, Prof. of Math. in Dartmouth College, N. H.

NOTE BY THE EDITOR.

As introductory to his discussion, the learned author adverts to the attempt which has been made to reduce the lives of the patriarchs to the present standard of longevity. Some have contended that the *years*, which they are said to have spent on the earth, should be reckoned as so many *months*. According to this hypothesis, several of them must have become fathers at 5, 6 and 7 years of age. Besides, there is no place in ancient chronology, which can be regarded as the transition point from the monthly to the yearly mode of com-

putation. Down to the time of Abraham, who lived 175 years, there is a gradual decrease of longevity. And if the years of this patriarch were so many months, his sorrow at being childless, so frequently referred to in the sacred narrative, was, to say the least, altogether premature.

§. 1. *The question stated.*

Moses wrote genealogy, not chronology, though the latter is interwoven with the former. This was in accordance with the oriental custom, so modified as best to suit the design of history. For chronology and genealogy are the foundation of all history; and, while we attach the most importance to chronology, and make genealogy a secondary affair, among the Hebrews, Arabs and Syrians, the contrary obtains. To perpetuate the remembrance of their names, they arrange and preserve, with great care, genealogies extending through many ages, which are taught, generation after generation, to children at a very early age. And they keep such genealogies, not only of men, but of camels and high-blooded horses. Hence, their whole history is, in a manner, genealogy; and the Arabs are always ready to trace the line of their descent, and name their ancestors back to Ishmael. The Arabic books are full of such genealogies. On the other hand, they are so very ignorant of chronology, as to know nothing of the time when important events in their history took place; and they most ridiculously confound the dates of occurrences of which they have taken accounts from the Scriptures. As, then, the general attachment to genealogy prevailed among the Israelites, both in their public and private documents, Moses so far complied with the feelings of his nation, as to illustrate his history by frequent genealogies; but, by noting the dates of the births and deaths, he interwove with these genealogies that *chronology*, whose aid he saw to be essential to a perfect history. And he has done this, not in this chapter only, but in the whole book of Genesis.

But in the antediluvian genealogy there are three very dissimilar readings. The *Hebrew* codices, written in *Hebrew letters*, exhibit one set of numbers; those in the *Samaritan* character, another, which the *Samaritan version* also follows; and a third is found in the *Septuagint*, and the versions made from it, except the *Ethiopic*, which, though translated from the Greek, has a fourth set of dates peculiar to itself. But of this

last, as it is of small authority, I shall not enter into any discussion, lest too great a variety of topics produce confusion. I am to speak, then, of the Hebrew, Samaritan and Greek systems of chronology, a summary of which is here given.

	Lived before the birth of a son.			Lived after the birth of a son.			Whole number of years.		
	Heb.	Sam.	LXX.	Heb.	Sam.	LXX.	Heb.	Sam.	LXX.
Adam . . .	130	130	230	800	800	700	930	930	930
Seth . . .	105	105	205	807	807	707	912	912	912
Enos . . .	90	90	190	815	115	715	905	905	905
Cainan . .	70	70	170	840	840	740	910	910	910
Mahalaleel.	65	65	165	830	830	730	895	895	895
Jared . . .	162	62	162	800	785	800	962	847	962
Enoch . . .	65	65	165	300	300	200	365	365	365
Methuselah	187	67	167	782	653	802	969	720	969
Lamech . .	182	53	188	595	606	565	777	653	753
Noah . . .	500	500	500						
Deluge . .	1656	1307	2242						

§ 2. *Division of the subject.*

There are *some* differences in these chronologies, which may be referred to the mistakes of copyists; others are systematic and intentional. The same sentence cannot, of course, be passed upon both classes.

To the first class are referable, or, at first view, appear to be so, many variations of units and tens. For instance, Lamech is said, in the Hebrew, to have lived before he begat Noah 182 years; after he begat Noah, 595 years; in all, 777; but in the Septuagint, the same periods are 188, 565, 753; and in the Samaritan, 53, 600 and 653. In such cases I have assumed no general principle, whether preference should be given to the Hebrew, Greek, or Samaritan; since, of three transcribers, A, B and C, there is an equal chance for A, B, or C to make the mistake. Nor is any more weight to be given here to the Hebrew text than to the Greek version. For, to say nothing of the fact that the text in the Hebrew character differs from the same text in the Samaritan character, the Greek was certainly translated from a Hebrew codex, in which,—as is alleged by the defenders of the Greek,—the translator found the numbers which now stand in the translation; nor can this, in the present stage of the discussion, be denied. In this case, the question must rest, not between the text and version, but between the Hebrew codices which have been handed down by

the Jews, and that very ancient one which was followed by the Seventy.

In regard to these *sporadic* varieties, if I may use a medical term, we must decide individually; and whatever reading is supported by the best authority must be preferred; or, that must be rejected, which is at variance with the general tenor of the history. And, in affairs of so high antiquity, of which we have no account but that given by Moses, we must think it no disgrace to suspend our judgment on some variety of reading; nor must we be ashamed sometimes even to confess ignorance.

But I mentioned another class of differences of reading, which are not the result of chance, but bear the marks of system and intention. These must be judged of, not individually, but collectively, and with reference to the theory or purpose which gave them birth. To this head I refer the fact that the Seventy, in the case of Adam, Seth, Enos, Cainan, Mahalaleel and Enoch, add 100 years to the age of each before the birth of a son, and subtract as many years from the remainder of their lives, according to an hypothesis that no man begat children before he was 150 years old. On the other hand, the Samaritan took it for granted that no one, except Noah, had children born after he was 150 years old; and, accordingly, from the 162, 187 and 182 years of Jared, Methuselah and Lamech, it subtracts 100 years each. Nor does it afterwards add them again, so as to make out the same number of years in the whole life; but, in accordance with still another hypothesis, it makes the life of man gradually decrease, not only in this genealogy, but in the other, which reaches from Noah to Abraham. For, as the ages of the first five patriarchs were gradually reduced from 930 to 895 years, the Samaritan translator would admit none afterwards of greater longevity, but continued the same manner of decrease down to Abraham, excepting Noah, and—if he can be said to have died—Enoch. There is yet another instance of designed variation in the subtraction of 5 years from the 800 which Jared is said to have lived after the birth of his son, so that his life might not reach beyond the flood.

§ 3. *The Hebrew preferred.*

In all this systematic disagreement, I reject both the Greek and the Samaritan readings, and follow the Hebrew, except in

the case of Jared, of which I speak with less confidence. But of this hereafter.

I prefer and adopt the Hebrew reading, because, in the first place, in no instance of the addition or subtraction of a century, does the Hebrew text stand alone, but is supported either by the Samaritan against the Greek, or by the Greek against the Samaritan. Surely, in a disagreement of three witnesses, two must be credited against one; and most of all must *he* be believed, who takes such an independent course, that he is supported now by one, and now by the other. Now, in this systematic disagreement, the Greek and the Samaritan differ throughout, so as to contradict each other in regard to the age of *each* of the first nine patriarchs; while the Hebrew, without following either, takes such a middle course as to have the concurrence of the Samaritan in the age of Adam, Seth, Enos, Cainan, Mahalaleel and Enoch, and of the Greek, respecting Jared, Methuselah and Lamech. On this ground, more credit seems due to the Hebrew than to the others. Suppose, in a legal trial, three witnesses should give testimony in this way, would any one hesitate which to believe?

§ 4. *Appearance of design in the Greek and Samaritan readings.*

Another reason for my preference of the Hebrew depends on the general principle, that any reading must be suspected, in which we detect a theory or design of the transcribers. Now these differences of a hundred years, in each life for nine generations, could not result from mistake or oversight of transcribers. Nor can they be charged to wilful alteration by the Hebrew copyist; for he, without the least appearance of order, asserts that some became fathers when scarcely 60 years old; others, not till they were more than 180. We must believe, then, that he copied his original as he found it, without alteration; and the alteration must be charged upon those whose purpose and views would be answered by it.

§ 5. *Absurdity of the hypotheses.*

I find a third argument in the very nature of the theories which I have mentioned: for they are full of silly hypotheses, so that, strange as it may seem, the very arguments urged by their supporters in their defence, furnish an unanswerable refutation of them.

The Seventy assume that no one could beget children before his one hundred and fiftieth year : and they are supposed to have taken this position from the consideration of the ratio which the age of puberty bears to the period of human life in more modern times. But those long-lived men might have come to maturity as early as we ; just as those, who now surpass the common age, and attain to the hundredth, or even the hundred and fortieth year, are not on that account any longer in coming to maturity, than others, who, in the common course of nature, die of old age, when not more than seventy or eighty.

The Samaritan on the other hand, takes it for granted that no children could be born to any one after his hundred and fiftieth year. But this hypothesis is overthrown by the case of Noah, who begat sons and daughters after his five hundredth year ;—a fact, which the Samaritan copyist has left unaltered.

Both the Greek translator and the Samaritan text, as well as the supporters of each, assume that each of these individuals, mentioned by Moses, was a firstborn ;* and this hypothesis, formed without reason, without the slightest intimation from the sacred historian, is adhered to with the superstition of a Jew. How extremely improbable is the conjecture, which makes Noah the tenth firstborn, in regular succession,—the firstborn of Lamech, who was firstborn of Methuselah, who was firstborn of Enoch, who was firstborn, etc., back to Adam ! On this principle, there could be, in the whole human race, but one firstborn, who must be descended through a line of primogenital ancestors, continued unbroken through every generation. Such a *primogenitus primogenitorum* could not possibly exist, if any one of the *primogeniti* should die without issue,—an occurrence, which, in the course of ten generations, is, from the statistical ratio of deaths, in the highest degree probable. For a very large proportion of the human race die young, even in boyhood ; nor has nature, by any means, exempted the first-born from the common lot.

Nor is this last hypothesis improbable merely ; but, strange as it may seem, it bears upon its face, in the very first instance, proof of its own falseness. For Seth, who is included in the genealogy of this chapter, and who is said to have been born

* Jackson, p. 50. Jared lived 162, Methuselah, 187, and Lamech 182 years, before they begat children.

after his father Adam was 130 years old—the Seventy substitute 230,—was not the firstborn, but certainly younger than Cain and Abel, and a number of daughters. So that there was nothing even to make room for the mistake. Neither could any one, who was not deeply tinged in the Jewish fables respecting the sacred primogenital stock, suppose that Noah had no children till his five hundredth year.

Not more credible is the other Samaritan hypothesis; namely, that the son, in every instance, from Cainan down to Terah, died at an earlier age than his father; with the exception only of Enoch and Noah. These are excepted by the Samaritan, as, on account of unusual sanctity, the one was rewarded by early intercourse with God, the other, by unusual longevity. According to the Samaritan, the vital power of the race decreasing, and the longevity of the son being, in every case, less than that of his father, Cainan lived 910 years, Mahalaleel 895, Jared 847, Methuselah 720, Lamech 653, Shem 600, Arphaxad 450, Salah 433, Eber 404, Peleg 239, Reu 239, Serug 230, Nahor 148, and Terah 145.

Now, though I would readily admit, that, after the deluge the term of human life gradually diminished from the time of Shem, still I should not think it a necessary consequence, that the son must invariably die younger than his father had died. For *now*, when the vital energy of our race has long been stationary, a son is often born of stronger constitution, and more vital power than his father; and while some, in the regular course of nature, wear out and die by old age, far more die of disease, which, without regard to age, may snatch away the father in youth, the son at a more advanced age, and leave the grandson to extreme old age. In like manner also, from Cainan to Terah, though, in the whole race, there was a constant diminution of longevity, still in individuals, that diminution does not seem to have been so manifest and invariable, nor does the duration of life seem to have been governed by any precise law. For who can suppose, that all these, for fourteen generations, died without disease, of old age alone? and that, compared with his contemporaries, no father was naturally more feeble, or son more vigorous, excepting only two men distinguished for their piety? The approach of death is not governed by a law so constant and regular; some are the victims of premature disease; nor are men of the same generation naturally endowed with equal physical firmness. For,

though the more common limit of old age, to those who are not cut off by disease or any external violence, is about 70 or 80 years, yet some, who are naturally more feeble, earlier decay, and fall into the grave, while others live a hundred, or a hundred and twenty years, or even more. Now to exclude all such irregularity from the Mosaic chronology is certainly to form a system foreign to nature. Suppose some one to forge this table of the kings of England: Henry VII. lived 63 years; Henry VIII. 63; Edward VI., 63; Mary, 63; Elizabeth, 63; James I., 63; Charles I. was deposed and executed by the people; Charles II. lived 63; James II., 63; William, 63; Anne, 63; George I., 63; George II., 63; George III., 63. No individual, not even the most ignorant of history, nor one who had never heard of these kings, would be stupid enough to believe this; but, merely from the equality of the ages, would suspect falsehood. But the Samaritan text predicates of the patriarchs a regularity as incredible, by making their ages continually decrease.

It is really surprising that this palpable falsehood should have found any supporters. For, if the term of life is so shortened that no son attains the age of his father, unless it is decreed by God as a special reward of distinguished sanctity, instead of the present promiscuous allotment of long life and early death, all must die the first year.

§ 6. *The Greek Translator of the Pentateuch.*

I have already hinted my suspicion, that those, who give us a reading which is too systematic, did not copy or translate what they found in the more ancient codices, but—as they supposed—corrected, or rather interpolated and corrupted the sacred text to meet their own views.

This charge will be the more difficult of evasion, if we find them guilty in other instances. In the continuation of the genealogy after the flood, from Shem to Abraham, we shall find the Greek translator guilty of manifest error; while, at the same time, the Greek copies are so much at variance among themselves, as to make it evident that most of them wrote, not what they found written, but what they thought most suitable, or what they wished had been written by Moses. In other respects, I have been accustomed to express a high opinion of the Greek translator of the Pentateuch; nor can I name, from all the rest, his equal in talent and learning. He was unequalled in his thorough knowledge of Hebrew; per-

sonally acquainted with the affairs of Egypt, not, indeed, aiming at the elegance of the Greek language, yet so well acquainted with it as to command whenever he wishes, the neatest style; and, when uninfluenced by other motives, faithfully translating word for word. But, having in his mind the philosophy and history of Egypt, and being anxious to render his author agreeable, not only to the Jews, but to foreigners, he sometimes puts forced meanings upon words; and, with still greater audacity, absolutely corrupts the reading. For, lest the Egyptian philosophers should draw from the sacred writings something in support of their errors,* he sometimes substitutes his own sentiments for those of Moses; sometimes changes the text, and makes it conform to Egyptian history; and finally, he alters whatever might seem likely to offend foreigners by its improbability. There is a marked example of this kind of alteration in the journal of the deluge. Now he, who has once or twice corrected, instead of translating, the original text, may well be suspected, in other instances also, where he differs from the Hebrew and Samaritan reading, of having acted the part of a corrector rather than that of a translator.

§ 7. *Comparison of Versions.*

Perhaps the question may seem to have been sufficiently settled by the preceding considerations, without regard to the evidence drawn from different versions, and from ancient commentators. We will, however, hear their testimony; and in judging of its value, we must recollect, that, as in court, those are not considered independent witnesses, of whom one received his account from the other, so the testimony of those, who read and interpreted a *version* alone, cannot have weight in support of the version, on a question respecting the ancient reading of the Hebrew text.

First, then, we will consider those whose testimony favors the Samaritan text. But, indeed, I know of no such, except the Samaritan interpreter himself. I suspect, however, that the Sam. Arabic version, which has been preserved in the Bodleian library, of which Durell published a description with a

* See my Dissertation "De indiciis Gnosticæ philosophiæ tempore Septuaginta Interpretum." It is the thirteenth of Vol. II. of the Syntagma.

specimen, is on the same side. But my conjecture as to what the witness would say, if he were questioned, is of no value. He must speak for himself, and, indeed, I should like to be informed by Durell, or Kennicott, in respect to the chronology of this version.

For the reading of the Seventy, I can give nothing worthy to be called an authority. For, though the ancient Latin and Coptic versions, and not a few of the Greek Fathers agree with the Seventy, still, these are not independent supporters, but followers and copyists. The old Latin and Coptic versions were translated from the Greek; and the Fathers, who are quoted by the defenders of the Greek chronology, read the Greek and not the Hebrew. It is a fact, moreover, though it scarcely seems possible, that the readings of the Greek version have, not only no evidence in their favor, but even positive evidence against them. For the Ethiopian translator, though he, in general, rigidly follows the Greek, does not in all these cases exhibit the same numbers; but respecting half of the ages in this genealogy, agrees with the Hebrew readings. But of this—no authority for the Greek readings having as yet been named—and also respecting Josephus, whom Jackson very triumphantly adduces as a witness for the Seventy, I shall speak hereafter.

We come now to the evidence of the correctness of the Hebrew text, as it has been delivered to us by the Masorites, and published in the *Hebrew character*. But, to avoid even the appearance of anxiety to maintain the opinion I have espoused, I leave out of the question four versions which agree with the Hebrew; these are the Chaldee of Jerusalem, and that of Pseudo-Jonathan, and the two Arabic versions,—the one, published in the Polyglott, the other, by Erpenius. I admit that these are more recent, and were made when the Masorites had, perhaps, already determined the reading of the Hebrew text; so that they might be expected to agree with the Masoretic edition. The following authorities, however, are, in my opinion, sufficient both in number and weight. In the first rank I put Onkelos; then the Syriac; and then Jerome, who, in the fourth or fifth century, found in the Hebrew books the same readings that we now have, and from them corrected the Vulgate.* Respecting Aquila, Symmachus and Theodo-

* Sciendum, quod usque ad diluvium, ubi in nostris codicibus

tion, Jerome has given us no direct information; but, from his silence in regard to them, we may infer that they agreed with the Hebrew text. Indeed, as to Symmachus, the fact is certain, as appears from a passage of Eusebius Emisenus, which Montfaucon has extracted, on the Hexapla, Genesis 5: 5.

If these authorities—the Chaldee, the Syriac, Symmachus and Jerome—are not enough to establish the Hebrew reading, I will add one more; which, incredible as it may seem, has never before been mentioned by any writer on this subject. In fact, this alone is enough to settle the whole controversy, at least between the Samaritan and Hebrew; so that I have some doubt whether the testimony of this witness will not cause half of my dissertation to seem superfluous. If we believe Jerome, the Samaritan codices, as late as the fourth century, had the same numbers as the present Hebrew text; in other words, the Samaritan codices of the fourth century support the Hebrew text against the *present* form of the Samaritan. Take and examine for yourselves the words of Jerome, showing the incorrectness of the Greek reading, in his Questions on Genesis, 5: 25.*

Of eight numbers, then, in which the Samaritan version, at the present day, differs from the Hebrew, this single extract has four, and those too, of the first importance; and it shows that, in the fourth century, the Samaritan had the same reading which we now have in the common Masoretic Hebrew Bible. The fifth number, that is, the whole age of Lamech, could not be the same in those Samaritan codices of Jerome, that it is in the later Samaritan; nor was it necessary to assign to Jared

ducentorum et quod excurrit annorum genuisse quis dicitur, in Hebræo habeat centum annos, et reliquos qui sequuntur. Again, Quia in ducentis erraverat (the ancient Latin translator) consequenter hic posuit septingentos, cum in Hebraeo hic habeatur, octingentos et supra centum.

Quæst. in Gen. 5: 3, 4.

* Siquidem et in Hebræis et Samaritanorum libris ita scriptum reperiet, vixit Mathusala centum octoginta septem annis, et genuit Lamech. Et vixit Mathusala post quam genuit Lamech, septingentos octoginta duos annos, et genuit filios et filias. Et fuerunt omnes dies Methusalæ anni nongenti sexaginta novem, et mortuus est. Et vixit Lamech centum octoginta duobus annis, et genuit Noe.

785 years—which is the sixth number different from the Hebrew—instead of 800, after the birth of his son, to prevent his living beyond the flood. It appears, therefore, perfectly evident that the later Samaritan copies, which differ from the Hebrew chronology in the fifth chapter, have been, by an unknown hand, corrupted in most of the numbers; and that they differ from the ancient Samaritan itself. Was this fact unknown to Houbigantius, the recent defender of the Samaritan chronology, or did he conceal it?

And on this point again, I should like to ask Kennicott and Durell, whether there may not be some Samaritan codices in the British collection, which have the same numbers as those found by Jerome in the fourth century? Likewise, what numbers has the Arabic version, written in the Samaritan character, which Durell found in the Bodleian library?

§ 8. *The testimony of Josephus.*

As the testimony of Josephus is of great importance in the question, he must be spoken of separately. That he read both the Greek and the Hebrew, and, as a compiling historian, compared them together, I could show, if this were the proper place, by numberless examples. Jackson cites him as authority for the Greek reading, never once supposing that his testimony would be against it. Nor can I deny that the Antiquities, B. I. ch. 3, coincides almost entirely with the Septuagint; except that there is a slight discrepancy in regard to the age of Methuselah and of Lamech, before the birth of sons. For he gives to Methuselah not 167 years, but, as the Hebrew codex, and, in fact, the former Greek codices, 187 years before he begat Lamech: to Lamech himself he gives, before the birth of Noah, 182 years, as it stands in the Hebrew. Now all these numbers of Josephus added give us, from the creation to the flood, 2256 years; while the numbers found in the Septuagint amount to 2242;—a slight disagreement, considering that it is in *numbers*, in which transcribers easily err.

But Ernesti, in his first “*Exercitatio Flaviana*,” has justly remarked, that this passage of Josephus has been almost entirely corrupted, to make it agree with the chronology of the Seventy, by transcribers who had been accustomed to read the Greek version. For though, as I just said, from the numbers

found here, the creation appears to have been 2256 years before the deluge, yet Josephus himself, in another place, where he has escaped the hands of false correctors, tells us that the building of Solomon's temple was commenced 3102 years after the creation, and 1440 after the flood; whence it follows that the flood took place A. M. 1662. This differs from the Hebrew account but very little,—only the small space of six years; of which discrepancy I shall speak again, after quoting the words of Josephus: * “Solomon began to build the temple . . . 1440 years after the deluge. And from the creation of Adam, the first man, to the building of the temple by Solomon, had passed, in all, 3102 years.” So then the 1662d year of the world is assigned to the flood, which differs immensely from the Greek chronology, but very slightly from the Hebrew. Indeed, Josephus seems in this place to have followed the Greek only in giving to Lamech 188, instead of 182 years, before the birth of his son. But to whatever conclusion we may come, respecting these six years, this is certain; if Josephus wrote this which we find in the history of Solomon, and upon which no suspicion of alteration has fallen, then what is found in the first book of the “Antiquities,” in the third chapter, in regard to the chronology before the deluge, cannot be the work of Josephus, nor can he have agreed with the Seventy in the number of centuries.

§ 9. *The Ethiopic version.*

I have already mentioned the Ethiopic version, which has, indeed, no weight as to the Hebrew reading, because it was made from the Greek. It has, moreover, numbers so contradictory and absurd, that no one can believe it, who can add 9 and 1. And yet, this very version deserves to be heard, because it convicts the Greek version of manifest corruption, and shows that other numbers, agreeing with the Hebrew, were formerly found also in the Greek. We will hear a *foolish* witness, who relates what he has been told so faithfully, as not even to vary from his authority to save his credit.

* Τῆς δὲ οἰκοδομίας τοῦ ναοῦ Σολομὼν ἤρξατο . . . ἀπὸ τῆς ἐπομβρίας μετὰ χίλια καὶ τετρακόσια καὶ τεσσαράκοντα ἔτη. Ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ πρώτου γεννηθέντος Ἀδάμου ἕως οὗ τὸν ναὸν ὑποδόμησεν ὁ Σολομὼν διεληλύθει τὰ πάντα ἔτη τρισχίλια καὶ ἑκατὸν καὶ δύο.

Job Ludolph tells Leibnitz,* that the Ethiopic version, though in other respects it follows the Greek *κατὰ πόδα*, has a different chronology, of uncertain origin ; but he does not explain what that chronology is. The Ethiopic language is known to but few, and those who are acquainted with it are destitute of books ; for the Ethiopic Pentateuch has never been printed ; whence it happens, that those who have very lately discussed the chronology and reading of the chapter before us—Jackson and Houbigantius—have neither examined, nor even named the Ethiopic version. But I have in my possession an Ethiopic Pentateuch in manuscript ; and can therefore bring forward this witness never yet examined ;—a witness, indeed, of not very great weight, but honest, and never wilfully swerving from the truth. But, as I use a manuscript copy, it is reasonable to show it to you, and to mention by what means it came into my hands, so that you may judge of its value. I received it as a legacy from my father, who obtained it from the library of John Henry Michaelis. It bears this title : “ Pentateuchus *Æthiopice*, a Christiano Ludolpho, illustris Ludolphi filio, ab exemplari Dn. Ludovici Piques, doctoris et socii Sorbonnae, quod illi Joannes Michael Wansleben, Romæ a se descriptum, vendiderat, Parisiis, anno 1684, descriptus.”

You may therefore call it the Wanslebenian, or Ludolphian copy, as you please. If any error has been committed by the copyists, I am not answerable for it ; every one must see that the numbers 90 and 60 have fallen from the whole ages of Mahalaleel and Jared ; a thing, which might very easily happen in the Ethiopic, because they write numbers, not in words, but with numeral characters borrowed from the Greek, but with distorted forms.

But the most important point, and that to which I wish to direct your attention, is, that in the age of each patriarch, in which the Greek differs from the Hebrew by a whole century, viz. Adam, Seth, Enos, Cainan, Mahalaleel and Enoch, the Ethiopian, like the Greek, adds the hundred years before the birth of a son, but does not subtract them from the remainder of the life ; in this respect, differing from the Greek as it now stands, and agreeing with the Hebrew. And though these six patriarchs are thus made to have lived each a hundred years more than they did, according to the Hebrew, Samaritan and

* Leibnitz' Epistolary Correspondence, p. 161.

Greek readings, yet the Ethiopian translator, a man of by no means bad intentions, was either so unobserving, or so faithful to his original, that he assigned to them the same ages which the other versions give them, copying what was before him, without any regard to the contradiction in which he involved himself. Here is a table extracted from the Wanslebian codex.

Adam lived, before he begat a son,	230,	after,	800:	Whole age,	930
Seth	"	"	"	206*	" 807 " 912
Enos	"	"	"	190	" 815 " 905
Cainan	"	"	"	170	" 840 " 910
Mahalaleel	"	"	"	165	" 830 " 805†
Jared	"	"	"	162	" 800 " 902‡
Enoch	"	"	"	165	" 300 " 365
Methuselah	"	"	"	187§	" 782 " 969
Lamech	"	"	"	182	" 595 " 777

The conclusion to be drawn from this is easily seen ; in that Greek codex from which the Ethiopic version was made, the years of the patriarchs after they had issue, and the years of their whole life were still the same that are found in the Hebrew. Thus, the very blots, as it were, of the corrupted chronology are almost presented to our eyes, and we can readily imagine how the change was brought about. For if, in the years after the birth of a son, and in the years of the whole life, the Greek copies had formerly the same numbers as the Hebrew, no one, who can count, or who can subtract 800, 807, 815 and 840 from 930, 912, 905 and 910, will doubt that the numbers of years before the birth of issue were also originally

* Here I think some one of the copyists must have erred ; or, possibly the Roman copy is in fault, having substituted 206 for 205. The Ethiopic figures answering to 5 and 6 differ but little in form.

† For 895. The middle figure, 9, has accidentally fallen out.

‡ For 962 ; the 6 having fallen out.

§ Here also, in the age at the birth of a son, the Ethiopic agrees with the Hebrew. And indeed some Greek copies, as the Alexandrine, have the same number.

|| In respect to Lamech, the Ethiopic agrees with the Hebrew throughout, and shows that, instead of the numbers 188, 565 and 753, some of the Greek copies formerly exhibited the same numbers as are now found in the Hebrew, viz. 182, 595 and 777.

the same in the Greek and the Hebrew ; and that they were afterwards changed. When and by whom this was done, is unknown, but it was certainly the work of some rash sytematizer.

If now the former Greek reading, and the Samaritan in the time of Jerome were different from what they are at present, and if they both agreed with the Hebrew, from which they now differ, what kind of critic, I ask, is he who would, in these very points, change the Hebrew text to suit the Samaritan or the Greek, as either may chance to please him ? Nor are these remarks made by one who is charmed by the name of the Hebrew text, and who admires it only as exhibited by the Masorites. For I have often charged that text with faults, and have, not unfrequently, corrected it by reference to the Septuagint and the Samaritan. But in this passage I think it more correct than the others.

§ 10. *Systematic discrepancies of the tens and units.*

Nor are the differences in the centuries alone to be referred to the systematic corruption, which I have mentioned, of the Greek and Samaritan ; but some, and, I begin to think, many tens and units, which differ from the Hebrew, are liable to the same suspicion. Nor was I myself aware, when I began to write, that so many numbers, which seem to vary from the Hebrew readings by chance, have been changed by some copyist or translator to make them conform to the Greek or Samaritan system. I will now mention those that seem to me to belong to this class.

1. To this class I refer the fact, that the Samaritan subtracts 15 from the 800 years which Jared lived after the birth of his son, leaving him only 785. For, if he had lived 800 years after the birth of his son, he must have survived the deluge ; which, according to the Samaritan chronology, occurred on the seven hundred and eighty-fifth year from the birth of Jared's son.* But as this seemed inadmissible, and irreconcilable with Moses' account, the Samaritan placed Jared's death in the very year of the flood, leaving us in doubt whether he died by disease, by old age, or, as is perhaps more probable, by the deluge itself.

* Add the age of Enoch at the birth of his son, 65 ; that of Methuselah, 67 ; of Lamech, 53 ; of Noah, 500, and 100 between that and the flood, and you have 785.

Moreover, necessarily from this account, his whole age must be, not 962 years, as the Greek and the Hebrew make it, but 847 ; which corresponds also to another theory—that he must die at an earlier age than his father, showing decreased longevity.

2. The disagreement of the Hebrew and Greek in the age of Methuselah is not the result of chance, but of design. But which of them is in fault might seem, at first sight, a difficult question. They agree in the whole age, 969, but differ in respect to the manner of dividing it,—the Greek subtracting 20 years from the age of Methuselah at the birth of Lamech, and adding as many to the remainder of his life ; in other words, placing the birth of Lamech 20 years earlier, than it is placed by the Hebrew. And here indeed, strange as it may seem, the Ethiopic version, made from the Greek, agrees with the Hebrew reading ; and the Samaritan, which usually differs from the Greek, in this case agrees with it in the number 67 ; the customary subtraction of a century making Methuselah 67 years old at the birth of his son.

This discrepancy cannot be considered as fortuitous, nor can it be referred to the mistakes of copyists ; because, in the first place, the twenty years subtracted from the former part of the life, are added to the latter part, or, if you choose, the twenty added to the former part, are taken from the latter part, so as to give the same number of years in the whole life ; which could not be supposed to happen by accident. And, secondly, another objection to supposing this discrepancy accidental is found in the fact, that the numbers sixty and eighty have no resemblance to each other, either when expressed in words,* or in letters ;† and, of course, give no occasion of error in transcribing. At least, I do not recollect, in the whole Hebrew Bible, in which I have collected from the versions, and from Josephus, many instances of variety of reading, ever to have found anywhere else, sixty substituted for eighty, or eighty for sixty. But, in order to form any opinion, or even conjecture as to the intention of the corruptor of the true text, we must examine the consequence of each reading.

If Methusaleh lived 167 years before, and 802 after the birth of Lamech, he must have lived 14 or 20 years after the flood ;

* שמינים and ששים.

† ט and ס.

14,* if we follow the Greek in the other numbers,—20,† if we follow the Hebrew. But this contradicts the account of Moses, who says that the whole world was overwhelmed with water, and that, except Noah and his sons with their wives, the whole human race perished. Nor, indeed, can it appear probable that Methuselah was preserved in Noah's ark. For it is incredible—if, besides his wife, and his sons and their wives, Noah had also received his aged grandfather into the ark—that Moses, speaking repeatedly of the same event, and mentioning frequently his sons, his wife and his sons' wives, should fail to mention the grandfather, in whose preservation there would be still more to interest the feelings of the reader;—whether he be considered as an old man, whom, though his life was almost spent, God would not suffer to perish in the waters, or, whether we regard the filial affection of the grandson, preserving his feeble grandfather from the destruction which overwhelmed the human race.

If, on the other hand, the Hebrew be correct, and Methuselah lived 187 years before, and 782 after the birth of Lamech, his death must have occurred on the very year of the flood. And it will seem probable, although different from the common belief, that this old man, to whom of all men God had granted the longest life, despising the warnings of Noah, and refusing to use the ship which he had built, unworthy to be preserved by his grandson's piety, perished in the waters. The common opinion, that he died in a good old age, a short time before the flood, rests solely on the ridiculous notion, that all the patriarchs were holy men,—as if holiness were hereditary.

From these considerations, there may seem to be some reason to suspect the Hebrew transcribers of having altered the ancient reading. For it may be said, that some one introduced the numbers 187 and 782, who wished to avoid the difficulty involved in the numbers 167 and 802,—that Methuselah would survive the deluge. On the other hand, we can see no motive which could induce either the Seventy, or their transcribers to change the reading; since, by saying that Methuselah lived 802 years after the birth of Lamech, they must involve themselves in the greatest difficulties.

* Add together the 188 years of Lamech, and 600 of Noah, you have 788. This subtracted from 802 leaves 14.

† 182 years of Lamech's life, and 600 of Noah's give 782. This subtracted from 802 leaves 20.

And yet there are other circumstances which favor the Hebrew reading, and show that the Greek, whether designedly or not, is manifestly erroneous. In the first place, as I have already remarked, the Greek is here deserted by its Ethiopian translator, who—in a Greek copy obtained from, I know not what source, perhaps from the Thebais, or possibly from Merœ itself*—found and translated into Ethiopic the same reading which we now have in the Hebrew, assigning to Methuselah 187 years before and 782 after the birth of Lamech. Before that time then, the Greek exhibited the same reading as the Hebrew. And the Greek copies of the present day are contradicted by the ancient Greek copies of the interior of Africa.

Again, the Samaritan version, which now agrees with the Greek in the number 67, is unquestionably corrupt; for in the time of Jerome, it computed the years of Methuselah precisely like the Hebrew text. I have already quoted the passage, but it will not be unreasonable to repeat the sentence which bears upon the point before us. Speaking of the old Latin version

* Merœ had the Greek Old Testament in the time of our Saviour. For it is said, Acts 8: 27—31, that as Philip travelled, the eunuch of the Ethiopian queen Candace—a standing name of the Merœnsian queens—was reading Isaiah, as I suppose, in Greek. But this is not the place to discuss my reasons for distinguishing Merœ from that Ethiopia, which gives name to the Ethiopic version—that is, Abyssinia—and for thinking that it was situated between Abyssinia and Egypt, in modern Nubia. I shall examine that question in a foreign geography of the Old Test., which I am preparing. If the Ethiopian had obtained the Greek Old Test. from lower Egypt, and so from Alexandria itself, it would not, in so many cases, agree with the Hebrew. For, when the Ethiopic version of the Bible was made, and long before, the Greek copies generally exhibited the same numbers as at present. But if, long before the Christian era, the Septuagint was carried by the devout from Egypt to Merœ, the Merœnsian copies might have escaped some of the alterations made in Egypt, and might have preserved in part the ancient readings. If this conjecture be correct, the Ethiopic version, though hitherto neglected, will appear to have considerable weight in deciding the merits of the Septuagint. A question which I intend to examine more fully hereafter.

made from the Greek, he takes exception to the account of the life of Methuselah, and says: "It appears then, that in this, as well as in many other places, there is an error in the number; since, in both the Hebrew and the Samaritan, I find it thus written: 'And Methuselah lived 187 years, and begat Lamech.'" In the only part, then, of the numbers in which the Samaritan copies of the present day agree with the Greek, they are corrupted, and differ from the Samaritan copies in use before the thirteenth century.

Finally, the Greek reading is evidently condemned by the rest of Moses' text, and is inconsistent with itself. For writing thus, the historian would have contradicted himself, asserting that the whole human race, except Noah and his wife, his three sons and their wives, were destroyed by a deluge 788, or 782 years after the birth of Lamech, and still, regardless of this assertion, affirming that Methuselah lived 802 years after the birth of Lamech. What answer would be made to this, either by the Seventy, or by those who first changed the numbers in the Greek, I cannot, with certainty, determine; but I suspect they thought that the whole human race was not destroyed by the flood, but that Methuselah and perhaps others escaped the flood upon some mountains, I know not what or where. Josephus also did not suppose that the rest of the human race were entirely destroyed by the deluge. For he speaks of others, besides the family of Noah, being saved from the flood, and, for a long time, not venturing* to descend from the mountains through fear of another flood. He moreover says that the water rose fifteen cubits above the level of the *plains*,† instead

* "The three sons of Noah first came down from the mountains, and dwelt in the plains, and persuaded the *others*, who feared exceedingly to come to the plains on account of the flood, to *follow their example*." Antiq. B. I. ch. IV. § 1.

† Ὡς ἐπὶ πῆχεις πεντεκαίδεκα τὴν γῆν ὑπεροχέειν. Antiq. B. I., ch. III. § 5. From anxiety to make his story more probable and less offensive to the ears of foreigners, than the account given by Moses would be likely to be, he has exhibited neither the fidelity of a historian, nor even a moderate degree of skill in mathematics;—in a word, he has written nonsense. For in a flood lasting almost a year, what is it to float over the earth at the height of fifteen cubits? And over what part of the earth? For one country or one territory may be higher or lower than another; and even the most level plains gradually decline

of the *mountains*, as Moses states. But these assertions are altogether destitute of proof. They not only contradict every other part of the account given by Moses, Gen. 7: 19, 20, but they are at variance with the accounts given by Josephus himself, by the Seventy and the other historians cited by Josephus. These all affirm that the ark rested on the mountains of Armenia, and that the tops of the mountains, after many days, emerged from the waters. If now the ocean actually rose to such a height as to cover the mountains of Armenia, there can have been no country, even on the opposite side of the earth, where the water would not be, by the equilibrium of fluids, of equal height.

The Seventy, then, are evidently in error, having numbers which cannot be reconciled even with their own version of the sacred history. And still I do not deny, that I am, as yet, foiled by my own argument; namely, that a reading is to be suspected of corruption, if we can discover any motive for corrupting it; and that no reason appears, why the Greek translators should insert 802 instead of 782, while by that very change they involve themselves, as we have seen, in inexplicable difficulty. In other words, it may be said that this reading indeed gives an impossible sense, but that its very absurdity shows its correctness, and proves that it has faithfully, though stupidly, followed its original.

What now if we find reason to suspect that the Greek translator, or corrector, disbelieved the total destruction of the rest of the human family, and the descent of all the nations now on earth, from Noah alone? Josephus certainly supposed many, besides Noah's family, to have escaped. Was there no dogma of Egyptian philosophy which the corrector wished to spare, but which was overthrown by the Mosaic account of the

towards the sea, and are elevated towards the sources of rivers, and the mountainous parts. Josephus would have given a truer and better account, if he had not endeavored to make the history of the Jews acceptable to foreigners. Yet surely a philosopher, like Aristotle, would not have been displeased by an account of the destruction, with the exception of a single family, of the whole human race. For Aristotle, without history or authority of any kind, was led by reason alone to suspect that there had been many conflagrations and inundations, from which but few escaped.

universal destruction of man by a deluge? Did he not fear that the whole account would be rejected by foreigners, if it opposed that dogma or tradition of the Egyptians? And did he not, to save the reputation of his prophet, change the numbers so as to accommodate the history to the notions of the Egyptians? I will not, indeed, assert any thing of this kind respecting the design of the corrector; but I may be permitted to offer such a conjecture, since the numbers in the Greek cannot have been written by Moses, unless he contradicted himself. In regard to Methuselah, then, the Greek corrector has either taken the position that others, besides Noah and his family, escaped from the flood; or he has forced upon Moses some Egyptian or Oriental tradition respecting Methuselah himself.

3. According to the Samaritan, Methuselah lived only 653 years after the birth of Lamech, and, of course, died at the age of 720. In this instance, also, the reading has been changed to suit a theory. For, in the six hundred and fifty-third* year from the birth of Lamech, the Samaritan translator placed the beginning of the flood, which he did not wish Methuselah to survive.

4. Again: according to the Samaritan version, Lamech lived 600 years after the birth of Noah, that is, 5 more than are assigned him by the Hebrew. This I consider as another of the same class of corrections. For, according to the Samaritan, the death of Jared and Methuselah, and, by this correction, of Lamech falls into the same year as the flood; so that we may naturally suppose them to have been destroyed by the deluge. Now, if I mistake not, the corrupter of the Samaritan, which, down to the time of Jerome, agreed on this point with the Hebrew, wished to make it appear, that impiety had increased so rapidly after the fifth generation, that of the four progenitors of Noah—his father, grandfather, great-grandfather and great-great-grandfather—Enoch alone, on account of the purity of his life, was snatched away by preternatural death, or, if you please, by translation; while the others lived till they saw the destruction of their descendants and of the whole race, and then perished with them, either because they were so blind and obstinate as to despise the divine threatenings, and refuse to provide for their safety with Noah, or

* From the birth of Lamech to the birth of Noah, were 53 years; from the birth of Noah to the flood, were 600 years. The sum is 653, as above.

because they were *unworthy* to be received into the ark, and preserved by their son. A fearful idea, and, from its very fearfulness, beautiful, and one upon which the painter, the poet and the orator may work, and excite the feelings. But the interest produced by such an hypothesis is no proof of its correctness, and, of course, no reason for a change of the reading.

5. According to the Samaritan, Lamech was 53 years old, at the birth of Noah. This account differs so widely from the Hebrew and Greek, that the discrepancy cannot be supposed to have resulted from the mistake of a transcriber. For who, through mere inadvertence or haste, could write 53 instead of 188 or 182? Nor are the words or the figures, which express these numbers, more similar in Hebrew, than in our own language. But here, also, we shall see reason to suspect intentional change, and an accommodation, in some respects, of the Samaritan to the Greek. Lamech lived, according to the Greek version, 753 years; according to the Samaritan, 653. Now, in this agreement of tens and units, may we not suspect that the Samaritan corrupter* of the numbers has been guilty of the same thing here as before, in the case of Jared and Methuselah;—namely, taking away a whole century from the life of Lamech, and leaving the other figures unchanged? He also wished Lamech to be drowned in the deluge, and, for that reason, gave him 600 years after the birth of Noah. These two corrections, of course, fixed the birth of Noah in the fifty-third year of his father's life.

All these discrepancies in the units and tens, so systematic, and so skilfully adjusted as hitherto to have concealed the artifice, must have resulted, not from chance, but from design,—not from the mistakes of transcribers, but from the theories of correctors.

§. 11. *Sporadic varieties of reading.*

There still remain a few instances of discrepancy of the class which I have called *sporadic*; in which there has been no intentional change, but the varieties of reading have been introduced accidentally, by mistakes in copying. In these

* I call him a *corrupter*, without qualification; because, from the passage of Jerome above cited, it appears that these numbers were formerly the same in the Samaritan as are now found in the Hebrew.

cases, each reading has equal weight; and the true one must be determined from the concurrence of other authorities.

1. I refer to this class the discrepancy in the age of Jared. According to the Masoretic Hebrew copies, he begat Enoch at the age of 162; according to the Samaritan, at the age of 62. The addition or omission of the words *וּמֵאָה שָׁנָה* (and a hundred years) might seem, at first sight, to be referable to the Greek or Samaritan theory, of which I have spoken above. But, in this instance, I think it may more reasonably be attributed to the mistakes of transcribers; because the Hebrew copies themselves are not agreed. For, as Jackson rightly observes,* on the authority of Abraham Echellensis, the Oriental Jews agree, in this case, with the Samaritan; and I myself have an instance to mention to you of the omission of these words in a Hebrew copy,—the Cassellan codex. In this, I have seen the words *וּמֵאָה שָׁנָה* (Gen. 5: 18,) omitted, and *written* in the margin. By this reckoning, the deluge must have occurred A. M. 1556.

In this case we cannot determine with so much certainty as in the preceding cases. The Masoretic reading, of 162 years, is, however, more probably correct. For, in the first place, Josephus agrees with it. In the passage before mentioned, where he has not been corrupted, he says that the building of the temple was commenced 3102 years after the creation, and 1440 after the deluge.† Thus he counts 16 whole centuries before the flood, while, as we have seen, there would be but 15, if this hundred years were left out. Again, to say nothing of the later Chaldee and Arabic versions, which exhibit the same reading, Onkelos, the Syriac and Jerome confirm the Masoretic reading. Thirdly, the Cassellan codex is here, in a manner, self-condemned; for, though it had given to Jared 62 years before, and 800 after the birth of Enoch, it still makes the sum of his age 962.

2. According to the Hebrew, Lamech was 182 years old at the birth of Noah; but according to the Greek, he was 188. In this one place—where it is deserted by its almost constant supporter, Jackson, who thought he was following the authority of Josephus—the Greek is perhaps more worthy of credit than

* Chronological Antiquities, T. I. pp. 51, 52.

† See § 8 of this article, and Josephus Antiq. B. VIII. ch. III. § 1.

anywhere else. In regard to Jackson's authority, it cannot be denied that Josephus, *Antiq. B. I. ch. III. § 4*, places the birth of Noah in Lamech's 182d year. But that whole passage has been so vitiated by transcribers, that it cannot be safely relied on, even when, as in this case, it agrees with the Hebrew. But in *B. VIII. ch. III.*, which transcribers seem to have left unaltered, in dating the building of the temple 3102 years from the creation, and 1440 from the flood, he evidently supposes from the creation to the deluge, an interval of 1662 years, six more than the Masoretic copies give. Now, of these six years no account can be given, unless we suppose that in his Hebrew copy, instead of 182, he found 188 years. Perhaps he found both numbers in the Hebrew copies, and forgetfully wrote 182 in one place, and 188 in another. But, however this question may be settled, his evidence is of great weight. For, where he unquestionably follows the Hebrew chronology, he still gives 188 years to Lamech before the birth of Noah, thus proving, beyond a doubt, that this was the reading in some of the Hebrew copies of his time.

But, again leaving out of the question the later Chaldee and Arabic, the Masoretic text and the number 182 are supported by Onkelos, the Syriac, Jerome, and, what is of still more consequence, the Samaritan in the time of Jerome. And though Jackson has silently neglected the striking testimony of Jerome in other places, on questions of greater importance, he must have the credit of having introduced it here. I have also still another witness in favor of the Masoretic reading; namely, the Ethiopian translator, who, as we have seen above, found the number 182 in the Septuagint itself.

In this case, though the authorities for the Hebrew are more numerous, and worthy of no small credit, yet, as Josephus favors the other reading, I shall give no positive decision, but, for once, avail myself of a privilege, by no means unworthy of a critic,—the privilege of doubting.

3. Lamech is said, by the Hebrew, to have lived, after the birth of Noah, 595 years, by the Greek, 565; consequently, his whole age is, according to the former, 777, according to the latter, 753.

But in this instance, as no ancient version coincides with the Greek, except those whose evidence is excluded; as Josephus himself—even in that chapter of which the principal part has been remodelled by transcribers to make it conform to the

Septuagint—differing from the Greek, makes the whole age of Lamech, 777 ; and, finally, as the Ethiopian translated from the Greek itself the numbers 182, 595 and 777, there can be no doubt that the Hebrew reading is the correct one.

ARTICLE VI.

THE COMMON SCHOOL SYSTEM OF NEW ENGLAND, WITH SOME ACCOUNT OF THE RECENT IMPROVEMENTS ADOPTED IN MASSACHUSETTS AND CONNECTICUT.

By Rev. Emerson Davis, Westfield, Mass.

“THE first colonists of Massachusetts and Connecticut, from which the other New England states derived their origin, were some of those men of learning, who were led to expatriate themselves by the joint impulse of promoting education, and of enjoying their religious opinions undisturbed.” There were among them many learned and pious men ; they were choice spirits, sifted from the best men of England at the close of the sixteenth century and beginning of the seventeenth. Many of them were trained in the cloisters of Oxford and Cambridge, and they united the learning of the best scholars of the age, with the piety and zeal of martyrs. It is said that the first founders of the Royal Society cherished for a time the purpose of coming to America, and of devoting themselves exclusively to the pursuit of science. Two of their number finally removed to the wilderness, and carried on a correspondence with the society at home.

Such men, coming to this country for such purposes, felt the necessity of making provisions for the education of all the children. The Puritans looked more mildly on death than on ignorance ; and this feeling passed down from sire to son, and has not yet ceased to animate many of their descendants. It is believed that the first provision, that was ever made by law for general education, was made in the Old Bay State. In 1636, only 16 years after the landing of the Pilgrims at Plymouth, a law was passed relative to the founding of Harvard College. “In 1642 a law was enacted requiring the selectmen of every

town, not to suffer so much barbarism in any family as that the parents and masters should not endeavor to teach, by themselves or others, their children and servants to read the English tongue, and to know the capital laws. The penalty for every such neglect was twenty shillings." The same law was enacted by the legislature of Connecticut in 1650. In 1652 the General Court of Massachusetts made it the duty of every town, containing fifty families or householders, to be constantly provided with a schoolmaster, who should teach the children and youth to read and write; and every town having 100 families was requested to set up a grammar school, and procure "some discreet person, of good conversation, and well instructed in the tongues, to keep it."

Previous to 1768, schools were sustained in Massachusetts by towns acting in their municipal capacity. Between 1768 and 1789, parishes were allowed to maintain schools by a tax upon the parishioners. The present district system had no legal existence until 1789. Up to this time there were many towns and parishes that had only one public school; many children were obliged to go three miles. The legislature deemed it "expedient to divide the territory of the towns into separate districts." The division is made by a vote of the towns; and each district forms a body corporate, having power to assess money for building a school-house, for the purchase of a library and apparatus, and for the transaction of all business pertaining to the maintenance of the school, except the raising of money for the payment of teachers. The same system substantially exists in all the New England states.

There is a constant tendency to multiply districts. Families, residing two miles or a mile and a half from the school-house, are anxious to bring it nearer. If a district which has 100 dollars annually to expend for the support of a school is divided, each has 50 dollars. In order to save travel, the school is diminished in length one-half. There are in Massachusetts twice as many district schools as there ought to be. Small districts build small and inconvenient houses, employ cheap teachers, and are very reluctant to make any appropriations for the purchase of apparatus, libraries, or the necessary furniture of a school-room.

The schools in Massachusetts are supported by money derived, 1, from direct taxation;—2, from the income of school funds. Each town is required to raise \$1 1-4 for each individual residing in the town between 4 and 16 years of age. If any town

raises a less sum, it forfeits its portion of the school fund for the year ensuing. This fund was created in 1835, from the unappropriated money received for the sale of lands in Maine, and from money due from the United States for military services; and is increased from time to time by adding to it half the proceeds, that may arise from the future sales of Maine lands, until the fund shall amount to one million dollars, which sum it may never exceed. At the beginning of 1840, the fund amounted to \$437,592. The number of children in the state between 4 and 16 years of age is 179,268. The amount raised by tax for the support of schools, in 1839, was \$477,221, or \$2 2-3 to each child.

The number of children in Connecticut between 4 and 16 years of age, in 1839, was 82,676. The expense of the schools in that state is defrayed in three ways.—1. From the interest of the school fund, which was created in 1795 by the sale of lands in Ohio, called the Connecticut Reserve. In 1839 this fund amounted to \$2,028,531. The interest of the fund amounts to \$104,900, and is distributed among the districts in proportion to the number of scholars. 2. By half the income of what is called the Town Deposit funds, the principal of which is \$764,670. A portion of the other half may be appropriated to the same object. There are, in some towns, local funds, which produce in all about \$7000 annually. 3. If the income of the state and local funds are insufficient to defray the expense of the schools, the *deficit* is made up by a tax. In 1839, \$18,000 were raised in this way.

“It has not been the policy of Connecticut, to attach any other condition to the reception of a portion of the fund, except that it shall be expended for the wages and board of instructors, duly appointed and approved, and upon schools kept in all respects according to law.” The Board of Commissioners have advised that some condition be annexed to the receiving of funds; either that the school shall be kept a certain number of months, or that a certain amount shall be raised by the people, or that the distribution shall be made in proportion to the actual *attendance*, rather than in proportion to the number of a suitable age to attend. The Commissioners say: “The fund does not secure its object, as it is now appropriated.”

The people of Connecticut, at an early period of their history, “embraced the idea of placing the education of their children beyond the reach of all contingencies, by investing the

means of its support in permanent funds, inalienably consecrated to this object. As early as 1743, seven new townships of land—the property of the state—were sold, and the proceeds devoted forever to the support of common schools; and to this fund were added, in 1765, certain sums due on excise on goods.”*

In Maine, every town is required to expend, for the maintenance of its schools, a sum of money not less than 40 cents for each inhabitant the town contains. If there be 2000 inhabitants of all ages, they must raise and expend \$800 for public schools, or they are liable to a fine, not less than twice, nor more than four times the amount of such failure or deficiency. Each town is required to make an annual return to the Secretary of State of the number of persons in the town between 4 and 21, of the number that attend school, and of the amount of money raised by tax, or otherwise, and expended for the benefit of the schools. Those towns that make their returns are entitled to their proportion of the school fund, which is derived from an annual tax upon banks. In 1838, it amounted to \$49,415. Besides this, many towns have a school fund derived from the sale of school lands; a section in each township being reserved for the support of schools. Such a section was reserved in each town in most of the New England states. In many places it was sold and expended in building the first school-house. Those towns in Maine that began to be settled about 1835, or that sold their lands, when the rage for speculation was at its maximum, secured a valuable fund. I know one town, having a population of 200, that receives from its fund an annual income of \$136.

I am not aware that there has been any material alteration in the school laws of New Hampshire, within 5 or 6 years. Common schools are established throughout the state, and the towns are divided into districts, as in the other states. For a great number of years, \$90,000 have been raised by a separate tax for the support of schools. Besides this, the interest of a State Literary Fund, which amounts to \$64,000, \$9,000 derived from a tax on banks are appropriated to the support of common schools. The number of children in New Hampshire, between 4 and 16, is not certainly known, but it is probably about 75,000.

Among the earliest acts of Vermont, were those providing

* Lectures of Am. Institute, 1838, p. 98.

for common schools. "Liberal reservations were made for their encouragement in all grants of land under the state government. In addition to the income of their lands, the towns were required to raise money by tax for the use of schools. In 1836, the surplus revenue of the United States was appropriated by the towns to the support of common schools. All the children between the ages of 4 and 18 are required to attend school; but there is no system of accountability by which towns, that may neglect to make ample provision for the education of the children, can be compelled to do their duty."* In 1825, the legislature passed an act, imposing a tax upon the banks in the state, and appropriating the money thus received, together with the income from "pedlers' licenses," to the creation of a fund for the support of common schools. The interest in education in the state of Vermont is increasing at the present time.

In January 1823, the legislature of Rhode Island appropriated \$10,000 annually for the support of public schools, to be divided among the several towns in proportion to the population; provided each town should raise by annual tax double the amount of its proportion of the state appropriation. This law has produced an increase in the number of the districts. There are about 700 district schools in the state; and in some of the towns very commendable efforts are making for their improvement.

I have now given a summary of the manner in which provision is made in the New England states for the education of every child in the rudiments of learning. To these little seminaries all the children are expected to be sent, from the age of 4 years until they are 16 or 18. There are but few countries in the civilized world, where free schools are open for the admission of all the children within a convenient walking distance from their homes. We have no means of compelling children to attend the common school; generally, however, the disgrace of being unable to read and write constrains most parents to send their children to school.

It must be acknowledged that the district schools of the Eastern states have been deteriorating for the last half century; and yet the cause of education has been constantly advancing. This apparent paradox is explained by the fact, that, during this period, *private schools* have monopolized the attention and

* Con. Com. S. Journal II. 153.

patronage of wealthy and influential men. They have transferred their interest from the common to the private school. The Secretary of the Connecticut Board of Commissioners says: "I would not be understood to cast any censure upon those parents, who patronize private schools. They act from the highest sense of duty to *their* children; but I fear they are not aware how serious an injury they inflict on the public schools, by practically pronouncing them unworthy of their attention by withdrawing a class of children whose loss is severely felt, and by commanding, at an advanced price, the services of the best teachers. The tendency of this, especially in cities and large towns, is to degrade the common school, as the broad platform where the children of the rich and poor should start together in the career of knowledge and usefulness, into a sort of charity school for the poor."

Not less than 12,000 children in Connecticut, in 1839, were educated in private schools, at an expense to their parents and guardians of \$100,000. In Massachusetts, 28,635 children and youth were educated in the same kind of schools, at an expense of \$241,114. Any one may easily see, that, if all these children had remained in the district schools, if the zeal which has been lavished by parents upon private seminaries had been expended for the improvement of the common school, *all* the children would have enjoyed the advantages, and made the proficiency that has been made by a few. Much is said against aristocracy; but I know of nothing that tends more directly to form a higher and a lower class in society, than the building up of private schools, at the expense of common schools. In the abstract of the Massachusetts School Returns, for 1839-40, may be found the testimony of many school committees, touching the bad effects of private schools upon common education. "It seems to be quite a common opinion, that district schools are established for the benefit of the poorer portions of the community only; and that the wealthy ought not to burden the public with the education of their children. But a more narrow and anti-republican notion cannot be published." "The children of the affluent are educated at the private seminary, and the children of those whose means are limited are sent to glean what they can from the public schools. If this state of things does not kindle up, in the minds of the youth, in these opposite schools, a feeling of consequence and superiority on one hand

and of inferiority on the other, it is not because the best means have not been used to produce the effect.”*

Another circumstance, that has retarded the progress of common schools, has been the want of a common superintending power. There has been no connecting link, that united schools in different and distant sections of the state together. They have been strangers and aliens to each other. “If any improvement in the principles or modes of teaching was discovered by talent or accident in one school, instead of being published to the world, it died with the discoverer. No means existed for multiplying new truths or for preserving old ones.” “If a manufacturer discovers a new combination of wheels, or a new mode of applying water, or steam power, by which stock can be economized, or the value of fabrics enhanced 10 per cent., the information flies over the country at once; the old machinery is discarded, the new substituted.” “Do we not need some new and living institution, some animate organization, which shall at least embody and diffuse all that is known on this subject, and thereby save, every year, hundreds of children from being sacrificed to experiments that have been a hundred times exploded?”†

About 20 years ago the attention of a few individuals was turned to the condition of our common schools. In 1824, J. G. Carter, Esq., of Massachusetts, published a series of letters to the Hon. Mr. Prescott, in a pamphlet of 124 pages, upon the Free Schools of New England. Respecting the repeal of the law, which required all towns, having 200 families, to support a Grammar School in which instruction should be given in higher branches, than in the district school, Mr. C. says: “The object and tendency of these higher schools were to raise the standard of instruction, and elicit talents and genius wherever they might be found.” But this feature of our school system—the support of one school of a higher order—has always been viewed with prejudice, and has been thought to be an institution to accommodate a few at the expense of the many. The poorer classes, for the better education of whose children they seemed almost indispensable, have always been most opposed to these schools. The law has at length been struck from the statute book; and no town is now bound by law to support any school of a higher order than the district school. Certain towns,

* Abstract 1839–40, p. 385. † Mann’s Lecture, p. 16.

however, are required, on condition they have no grammar school, to raise 25 per cent. more than they have done for the support of schools in the districts.

It is strange that the poorer class of people, who depend almost entirely upon the free schools for the education of their children, should be so generally opposed to raising money for their support; and also to the appropriation of small sums, from time to time, for improving their condition. This hostility on the part of the poor has probably had much influence upon wealthy and enterprising men, and determined them to remove their children to private schools, which they could make what they pleased to have them. If such has been the effect upon wealthy men, they deserve censure; for more is lost to society by the continued ignorance of the many, than has been gained by the improved education of a few.

Soon after the publication of Carter's Letters, a series upon the Importance of Teachers' Seminaries was written by Rev. T. H. Gallaudet, of Hartford. In 1826, Gov. Lincoln, in his annual message to the legislature of Massachusetts, said: "Various propositions for the advancement of education, by the establishment and endowment of institutions for qualifying teachers of youth——have recently been brought before the public, and will solicit the fostering care of the legislature." During that session, the subject of the proposed seminary was discussed, but public sentiment was not prepared for action, and the plan was abandoned. The school laws were revised during that session, and no further action was had upon the subject until 1837, except the passage of the law of 1835, by which the school fund was created.

In January, 1826, a Monthly Journal was commenced at Boston, devoted exclusively to the interests of education. It has been continued to the present time; though its circulation has been limited. It is now called the *Annals of Education*. The influence of this periodical has been considerable. It has done much towards arousing attention to this subject.

In 1830, Rev. Asa Rand published, in Boston, a weekly paper, called the *Education Reporter*, which was merged in the "*Annals*" in less than two years, for want of support. Not far from this time, Mr. Josiah Holbrook interested himself in the cause of popular education; he has since spent most of his time in giving lectures, and in organizing lyceums in different parts of the United States. He also prepared many cheap ar-

ticles of apparatus, and succeeded in securing their introduction into many schools.

In August, 1829, the American Institute held its first annual meeting. Its annual sessions continue four or five days; during which eight or ten lectures are given, upon subjects pertaining to the cause of education, by gentlemen from various parts of the country. There are often present at these meetings several hundred school teachers. County conventions began to be held in Massachusetts, about the time the Institute was formed, for the purpose of an interchange of opinions upon the great subject that was beginning to agitate the public mind. These movements were not confined to the Bay state, but extended over all New England.

It was foreseen that the frequent discussion of this important topic would result in legislative action. In April, 1837, the legislature of Massachusetts constituted a Board of Education, consisting of the Governor and Lieut. Governor for the time being, and eight other gentlemen appointed by the Executive of the commonwealth. The term of their office is eight years, with a *proviso* that one vacancy, and consequently one new appointment shall be made annually. They have authority to appoint a secretary, who devotes his whole time to the business of the Board, and is paid by the state. The *services* of the members are gratuitous; their expenses being paid by the state. The duties of the Board are: "1. To prepare and lay before the legislature in a printed form, on or before the 2d Wednesday in January, annually, an abstract of the school returns received from the towns by the secretary of the commonwealth. 2. To make a detailed report to the legislature of all their doings, with such observations as their experience and reflection may suggest upon the condition and efficiency of our system of popular education, and the most practicable means of extending and improving it."

In consequence of the organization of the Board, conventions have been held in each county in the state for four successive years. The Secretary of the Board attends all these conventions, and delivers at each an address. A part of the time is spent, on these occasions, in discussing plans of improvement, and in eliciting information from the friends of education in the county. At the close of the year, the Secretary makes a report to the Board, which is by them laid before the legislature and published. Four of these reports have already been issued from

the press; and scattered in every town in the state. In the report of 1837, the following topics are discussed at some length: 1. The condition of school houses; 2. The manner in which school committees discharge their duties; 3. The interest felt by the community in the education of *all* the children; 4. The competency of teachers. The report of 1838 speaks of improvements that are beginning to be made, and dwells at considerable length upon *reading* and *spelling*. The report of 1839 is principally occupied with a statement of facts respecting libraries of every kind in the state, and the means that the young have for improving their minds by reading. The report of 1840 may be considered a treatise upon the condition and wants of the schools.

Besides this the Secretary has compiled three volumes of school returns. The volume for 1838-9 is an 8vo, of 340 pages, and that for 1839-40 contains 480 pages. The school committee of each town is required by law to present a detailed report of the schools under their charge to the town; which is to be read in open town-meeting, and a copy of the same transmitted to the Secretary of State. In these reports the committees mention existing defects, improvements that have been made, successful modes of teaching, and propose further improvements. Out of this mass of documents, containing the collected wisdom of 1500 committee-men, the Secretary of the Board selects the most valuable matter, and the legislature spreads it over the whole commonwealth. The last volume is one of great interest, and richly worth to the state all the money that has been paid from the public treasury in consequence of the organization of the Board. It is a repository of information that cannot fail of doing much good. Its benign influence will be felt in other states, and it will add another stone to the monument, that commemorates the illustrious deeds of this ancient commonwealth.

In June, 1838, the legislature of Connecticut constituted a similar Board, with power to appoint a secretary. Its plan of operation is very similar to that of Massachusetts; its published documents are much less voluminous, but valuable and creditable to the character and zeal of the Secretary. A Common School Journal is published semi-monthly in each of these states, edited by the Secretaries. By these much light is thrown upon the public mind, and an interest in the cause of education kept alive. The other New England states are waiting the success

of the experiments making in Massachusetts and Connecticut. If these shall be satisfactory,—and there is no doubt they will be, if suffered to go on,—they will adopt a similar plan for the improvement of their schools.

The organization of a Board of Education was not a sudden, nor unheard of measure. In 1812, Dr. Dwight said: “One thing that is necessary to render our common school system complete is the institution of a Board of Commissioners, one in each county, whose business it shall be to examine into the state of the schools in their respective circuits, and who should meet semi-annually to receive the reports of the town committees, and compare them with the results of their own inspection and make a general report to the legislature.”* Almost the precise plan recommended by Dr. Dwight in 1812 was adopted by the legislature of Massachusetts in 1837, and by that of Connecticut in 1838. The same plan has been substantially recommended by other friends of Education, at sundry times during the last fifteen years.†

In the winter of 1838, a gentleman in Boston, through the Secretary of the Board, proposed to give \$10,000 to be expended by the Board in an experiment upon normal schools, provided the state would add to it an equal sum. The proposal was accepted by the legislature, and \$20,000 were intrusted to the Board to try the experiment of normal schools, or teachers’ seminaries. The Board accordingly undertook the solution of a difficult problem, feeling that momentous consequences depended upon its being conducted in the best manner possible. I shall not have occasion to speak of the nature and importance of these schools, for it has been well done in an article in a preceding No. of the Repository.‡

A normal school was commenced at Lexington,—where the first British blood was shed in the war of the Revolution,—in July, 1839; and in September of the same year, another was opened at Barre. In September, 1840, a third was opened at Bridgewater. The Board say that the experiment thus far is satisfactory. There can be no doubt, I think, of the general utility of these schools. But the great question yet to be decided is, whether the people in this country are sufficiently awake

* Dwight’s Travels, Vol. IV. p. 297.

† Literary and Theolog. Rev. Vol. II. p. 332.

‡ Vol. X. 1st series, p. 90.

to the importance of this class of seminaries to be willing to endow and sustain them. The legislatures probably are not; individuals, therefore, must do the work.

The question may be asked by some, whether all the people in these states, in which these improvements are making, cordially approve of these educational movements? It would be very strange if they were. Men are always opposed to innovation, and especially, if it costs any thing. More opposition has been experienced in Massachusetts than in Connecticut, for the simple reason, that the latter state follows after, and, profiting by the example of her sister, avoids those points that excite the most opposition.

There have risen up in the Bay state three distinct classes of opponents. The opposition of one class is based on the expensiveness of the Board of Education. The whole expense, including the salary of the Secretary and extra printing, amounts to less than \$2,000 annually. There is one town in the state that pays \$1,000 to a man for superintending the schools within its limits. Who will say that it is extravagant for a state to pay \$2,000 for overseeing the education of 180,000 children, at an expense of three-fourths of a million dollars? The *second class* of opponents are those who are fearful that it is a plan for subverting the religious sentiments of the rising generation, and for turning them away from the old paths. It has been my privilege to be somewhat conversant with the opinions and views of those men who have taken the lead in this movement, and I am fully persuaded that they honestly desire to improve the schools, and to furnish to all the children greater facilities than they now have for acquiring a useful education. I do not believe they will attempt to subvert the religious faith of the people, nor do I believe they can do it if they would. The *third class* of opponents comes from the book-selling interest. This brings me to a new topic, which requires some explanation.

Previous to the organization of the Massachusetts Board of Education, the legislature passed a law authorizing each school district to raise money for the purpose of establishing and maintaining a common school library and apparatus for the use of the children of the district; with a *proviso*, that no greater sum than \$30 shall be expended the first year, nor more than ten in any subsequent year. The Board considered the law an important one; they say: "To what avail are our youths taught to read if no facilities exist for obtaining books? The keys of

knowledge are useless to him who has no access to the volumes to be unlocked." They supposed some difficulty would be experienced by most districts in making a suitable selection for a library. It was foreseen that the publishers of books might get up their school libraries, and vie with each other in their efforts to furnish the schools, and that many useless, and perhaps pernicious books might fall into the hands of the children. The Board, therefore, felt themselves called upon to do what they could to facilitate the execution of that law. They accordingly made proposals to several publishers to ascertain on what terms they would furnish books of a given size, and executed in a given style. It was thought desirable to have the books well made and cheap. An arrangement was made with a publishing house in Boston, which pledged itself to manufacture the books, in the style prescribed, in sufficient quantities to supply the schools; provided that each book in the library should have the approval of each member of the Board on its first page.—It may be thought by many readers of the Repository, that this detail is needless. I enter into these particulars, that it may be seen that the publishers of books have no reason to find fault; for if the books are once introduced into the schools, a taste for reading will be cultivated, and booksellers generally will be benefited by an increased demand for books. Why then should publishers look with an envious eye upon the firm that furnishes the school libraries? The state does not pay them a single dollar; nor have they any pledge of pecuniary aid from any quarter. They prepare the books at a great expense, to be remunerated by the small profits arising from the sale of books; I say small profits, for the prices of the volumes are fixed, by contract with the Board, at as low a rate as it was supposed they could be afforded.

The library when complete is to embrace "two series of 50 volumes each; the one to be an 18mo, averaging from 250 to 280 pages per volume; the other in 12mo, each volume containing from 350 to 400 pages." About 40 volumes are already published. Among them are found the Life of Columbus, by W. Irving; Paley's Natural Theology, in 2 volumes, with selections from Lord Brougham and Sir Charles Bell, illustrated with numerous cuts; Lives of Individuals celebrated in American History, selected from Sparks' American Biography, 3 volumes; and Sacred Philosophy of the Seasons in 4 volumes, by Rev. Henry Duncan, D. D. It is unnecessary to name them

all; those I have mentioned are a fair sample of the whole. I have read most of them, and find in them much to admire and nothing to condemn. The Board did not consider themselves at liberty to select and recommend religious books; neither did they suppose that such were most needed. Most of the children in the commonwealth are supplied with books of a religious character from the Sabbath school libraries. It seemed more necessary that they should have access to works of information, to popular treatises upon natural and physical sciences, to memoirs, histories, and interesting miscellaneous publications.

The School Library is edited with great care and ability. Each volume has an index and glossary, in which every word in the book, not found in school dictionaries, is fully explained. Every quotation from other languages is translated, and the volumes are adapted to the capacities as well as to the wants of the young.

I need not say any thing by way of argument to show the importance of libraries in district schools. I do not know that any one denies that they are valuable. The time is probably not far distant, when a library will be considered as essential to the welfare of a common school, as it now is to the interest of a Sabbath school. The munificent appropriation made by the state of New-York is important testimony in their favor.*

The great objection, that has been urged against school libraries in Massachusetts, is, that the Board of Education, in making the selection, will introduce books that inculcate the sentiments of some one religious sect, and exclude others. The majority of the Committee on Education, in the legislature of 1840, recommended that the Board be abolished; and one of the reasons was the following: "It is professed, indeed, that the matter selected for this library will be free both from sectarian and political objections. Unquestionably the Board will endeavor to render it so. Since, however, religion and politics, in this free country, are so intimately connected with every other subject, the accomplishment of that object is utterly impossible; nor would it be desirable, if possible. That must, indeed, be

* The legislature of New-York by two acts, passed in 1838 and 1839, have appropriated \$110,000 annually for three years, for the purchase of libraries; which is to be divided among the districts, and any one may draw its share, if the inhabitants of the district will add to it an equal sum.

an uninteresting course of reading, which would leave untouched either of these subjects.”*

I can hardly believe that the writer of that report seriously believed his own assertions. Is it essential to the interest and utility of every book, that it should dwell more or less upon religion and politics? Are not such books as the Pursuit of Knowledge under Difficulties, Buel on Agriculture, and popular treatises on Chemistry, Philosophy, Astronomy, Geology and the Arts, free from partisan views of religion and politics, and, at the same time, interesting and useful? I suppose the writer of the above mentioned report presumed that the library was to be a religious and political library, and still contain nothing more favorable to one party or sect than to another. It is admitted that such a book, if it could be made, would do no good, but much hurt. I see no difficulty, however, in selecting a valuable library made up of books of information, to be used in a school composed of children from families differing widely in their political and religious opinions, which shall be useful and acceptable to all. Let not the objections, that have been made to a Board of Education, to school libraries and to plans for improving schools in Massachusetts, discourage the people in other states, and keep them from improving their common school system. A variety of circumstances have operated in this state to create some division among the people, and to awaken opposition. If the Board had been organized two years earlier or two years later, there would have been fewer objections urged against it. But it is well as it is; opposition has produced discussion, and I have no doubt that the people generally are better informed upon every thing pertaining to common schools, than they would otherwise have been.

It was my intention to have dwelt upon the subject of moral and religious instruction in the public schools in New England, but I cannot do justice to this topic without protracting this article to an unreasonable length. I have endeavored to present as correct a view of the common school system of New England, and as faithful a narrative of the improvements that have been made, as the brief space to which I limited myself would allow. Frequent inquiries are made by the friends of education in other states respecting the common school system of the eastern states. If I have succeeded in presenting the great outlines of the system my object is accomplished.

* Massachusetts School Journal, Vol. II. p. 228.

ARTICLE VII.

THE RABBIES AND THEIR LITERATURE.

By Isaac Nordheimer, D. P. Prof Orient. Lang., Univ. of the City of New-York.

HISTORICAL SKETCH OF THE RABBINICAL SCHOOLS IN PERSIA.*

AFTER the composition of the two Talmuds, the Jewish teachers, being no longer under the necessity of communicating the mass of their doctrines by means of oral tradition, confined themselves chiefly to the explanation of these written documents, by assigning for the precepts contained in them various reasons of their own, which were afterwards altered and appended to the Talmud. These learned men were named Sopherim (סופרים), to distinguish them from the authors of the Mishnah, called Tenaim, and of the Gemara, called Amaraim. (See the former Article.)

The influence of the rabbies became gradually confined to the districts under their immediate jurisdiction; and the office of Resh Glutha, now grown more secular in its character, came to be an object of ambition to persons of wealth and importance, who farmed or purchased it of the sovereigns of the country. The Beth Nasi (בית נשיא), or family in whom it had for centuries been hereditary, was nearly extinct. One Rabbi Hanina, who had formerly been sentenced by the Resh Glutha to lose his beard, on account of some opposition offered by

* The first article of this series, on *The Talmud and the Rabbies*, (Bibl. Rep. Oct. 1839,) contained an outline of the history of the Rabbinical schools till the composition of the Talmud, with a brief summary of the contents of that work. This history we now continue to the time of Maimonides; and, although the obscurity and barrenness of the details, that have reached us concerning this period, may give the article a fragmentary character, the writer hopes it will not be found entirely destitute of interest and information. It may be affirmed as a surprising fact, that while almost every department of historical science has been cultivated with success, the history of this ancient and certainly interesting people has not

him to the latter's authority, had the magnanimity to adopt and educate the last surviving descendant of this once powerful house,—a boy named Mar Sutra. On reaching the age of fifteen, the lad was brought before king Firus (A. D. 480), and received from him the appointment to the vacant office of Resh Glutha; the former incumbent, one Pahara, having just died from the sting of an insect in his nose;—a circumstance which Mar Sutra and his posterity commemorated by placing the figure of the insect on their seal. About twenty years after, however, Mar Sutra came to an untimely end; he being executed together with his adopted father by king Kobad, in consequence of a revolt raised by one Mir, who undertook to fulfil an ancient oracle by obtaining the independence of the Jews. Mar Sutra, junior, the son of the preceding, thereupon fled to Tiberias, where he was well received, and where he gave a new impulse to Talmudical studies.

The condition of the Jewish schools in Palestine became greatly changed, by reason of the disturbed state of the country from the year 589 to 630. The head of the schools now received the appellation of Gaon (גאון, excellency), in imitation of the

yet received that degree of attention which it deserves. The result is, that the few treatises on Jewish history that we possess are mostly mere recitals of the numerous harassing persecutions that the nation has undergone, and enumerations of the reproaches, just and unjust, that have been made against it, in all times and in all parts of the world; while but little attention has been given to the important task of investigating the hidden causes of the occurrences which chroniclers relate: at the same time the prevalent idea respecting the literature of the nation, is that it consists of a small number of volumes containing little else than puerilities and useless subtleties. One distinguished exception, however, exists in the learned and truly classical work of Dr. Jost (*Allgemeine Geschichte des Israelitischen Volkes*), quoted by us in the former article. This writer has exhibited great diligence and accuracy in developing the origin of the events of Jewish history; while he has also bestowed a good share of attention on the national literature. His work and a well conducted periodical (*Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift für jüdische Theologie*), edited by Dr. Geiger with the aid of several learned Jewish theologians, have constituted our principal sources in preparing this sketch.

titles *illustres* and *clarissimi* bestowed by the court on the rabbies of Tiberias. In several cities there were seminaries of some note, and those in Sura and Pumbeditha again acquired, and for a time maintained, somewhat of their former superiority. The principal seat of the Gaon was accordingly in Sura, while the Resh Methibhta (ראש מחיבתא), or head of the school, was stationed at Pumbeditha. Besides these dignities, there was the more secular one of Resh Glutha, who was chosen by the representatives of the congregations, the two above mentioned chiefs presiding at the election. The candidates for this important station were nominated by the king, whose choice was greatly influenced by the value of the presents they severally made him. At the close of the election, the two chiefs of the schools consecrated the new official by the imposition of hands. The conclusion of the ceremony was announced by sound of trumpet to the people, by whom rich offerings were made to the newly installed dignitary; while he in his turn entertained his electors with a feast that lasted several days. The following Sabbath, after a solemn service, the appointment of the new Resh Glutha was proclaimed; it being at the same time notified that the congregation was to be under his immediate charge, and also what taxes they would be required to pay. After returning home from the synagogue, the Resh Glutha no more went abroad on foot, but rode in a gilded carriage, with an escort of fifteen men and a foot-runner. He no longer attended religious services in public, but had them performed in his own house. He kept his secretary, and held a separate court for his own diocese, independent of those in Sura and Pumbeditha. His authority was upheld by the king, at whose court, when business called him thither, he always appeared with a princely retinue.

In like manner, but with less pomp and ceremony, the two subordinate chiefs of the school were elected by the college of rabbies out of their own body; and to each of them was assigned a diocese from which his income was to be derived. The three courts thus instituted sent out judges, furnished by them with diplomas, among the smaller congregations; and each of these judges, with two respectable inhabitants of a place, formed a temporary or circuit court, in which they settled disputes, made legal contracts, and performed other judicial functions, for which they received stated fees. The surplus of the income derived from this source was assigned to the support of studious

youth. The school of the Gaon, which formed a minor sanhedrim, always numbered seventy teachers, who held daily meetings in the months Elul and Adar; at these meetings the pupils were present, and took part in the councils and arrangements. During the rest of the year, each one attended to his own affairs at home,—those alone remaining in the schools who were intended for future rabbies. On each Sabbath of these two months, the students underwent an examination; and such as distinguished themselves above their fellows were rewarded with a pension. These practices were kept up in imitation of the customs prevailing at the time the Talmud was composed; although the efforts of instructors were now directed to the interpretation of that work, rather than to the forming of new laws.

HISTORICAL SKETCH OF THE JEWISH SCHOOLS IN MESOPOTAMIA UNDER
THE DOMINION OF THE CALIPHS.

The history of the Jewish teachers and their schools in Mesopotamia, during the century following the conquest of Persia by the Mohammedans, offers nothing but a barren list of names, if we except a few rabbinical authors who flourished during that period. The rabbies were at that time in complete subjection to the Resh Glutha, who exercised a sovereign sway over the Jews, appointing and dismissing their teachers at his pleasure and without any responsibility. This functionary was usually a rich man, or became so by his office. His favorable position in the royal court sometimes proved a temptation to abuses of power, which the rabbies, mostly men retired from the affairs of the world, found it difficult to resist.

It is to this period (about A. D. 750), when among both Christians and Moslems a philosophical spirit of inquiry began to be directed to traditional observances, and when many among the Jews were led by similar views to oppose the tendency of rabbinism, that the revival of an ancient sect under a new form is to be ascribed. The immediate cause of this event is said to have been, that, on the election of a Resh Glutha or Gaon, a distinguished scholar, named Anan, was defeated by his brother, a much inferior man. Anan, however, remained at the head of a numerous party, who would acknowledge no other chief. This becoming known, he was arrested and subsequently sentenced to death, as a stirrer up of sedition among the people.

In these circumstances an Arabian fellow-prisoner advised him to request an audience of the Caliph, and make known to him the antiquity and extent of the party opposed to the authority of the Talmud. By this means Anan is stated to have succeeded in obtaining his personal freedom, with permission to remove to Palestine with his whole party, which permission was carried into effect in the year 754.

The sect to which Anan belonged was distinguished by the name of Karaites (קראים, scripturists). They rejected all rabbinical traditions, regarding the Mosaic law as the sole ground of religious knowledge and legal jurisdiction; and although they afterwards found themselves under the necessity of rearing a new traditional structure, they still adhered to the principle that every authorized teacher is at liberty to explain the Holy Scriptures in his own manner, without being bound by the views of his predecessors. Anan, having established himself in Palestine, ruled over it as Nasi (נשיא). He was succeeded by his son and a number of others who retained this title; though, after the lapse of several centuries, it was exchanged for that of Hacham (חכם). The sect of Karaites never became of much note, nor did they manifest any desire for wealth and power; agriculture, the handicraft arts, and trading in provisions formed their almost exclusive occupations; the Bible and the sciences connected therewith, almost their only study. Their moral character has ever remained unimpeached. The opposition of the Karaites to the Talmud has continued to this day;* and the justification of this conduct in general and in detail has formed their principal literary pursuit. The many books composed by them, among which are numerous treatises dogmatical, philosophical, historical, hermeneutical and grammatical, written partly in Arabic and partly in Hebrew with an admixture of Arabic, have all the same general tendency, which gives to their whole literature a polemical aspect.

The great contrast in the characters, views and modes of living of the rabbies and the Resh Glutha not unfrequently caused subjects of discord to arise between them. Thus the Resh Glutha, David ben Saccai, placed over the school of Sura one Yom Tobh, a man of obscure origin and who had been a weaver by trade. (A. D. 910.) In consequence of the dissatisfaction caused by this person's conduct during the seventeen years that

* See Bibl. Rep. Oct. 1834, pp. 565 et seq.

he held the office of Gaon, the school of Sura became almost entirely deserted. The like system of mismanagement soon after reduced that of Pumbeditha to nearly the same condition; when, to avert its utter downfall, they elected Mobasser, the son of a rabbi, to the Gaonship without the concurrence of the Resh Glutha. The latter, enraged at the slight thus put upon his authority, appointed the priest Zedek to the office; but the point being strongly contested, he was compelled to yield. On the death of Yom Tobh, two candidates were set up for the vacancy,—Saadiah ben Joseph, of Fayum in Egypt, and Zemach,—the former on account of his eminent learning, and the latter for his birth, he being descended from a former ruling family. David, the Resh Glutha, had intended to appoint a favorite of his own; but the latter declined the proffered honor, and at the same time recommended Zemach as the most fitting candidate. His choice, however, ultimately fell on Saadiah, who was appointed Gaon at the age of thirty. Notwithstanding the favor thus shown him, Saadiah, who was a man of firm and independent character, remained closely attached to the interests of the rabbies, even when it involved opposition to the will of his patron. Thus he once refused to subscribe to a decision of the latter ~~relative to an inheritance~~, although his signature was requisite to its legality. When David found that he could not succeed in compelling his refractory subordinate to succumb, he pronounced a sentence of excommunication against him, and appointed another Gaon in his stead. Saadiah retorted by pronouncing against David a similar sentence, and by nominating Hassan Joshua, David's brother, Resh Glutha in opposition to him; but being unable to gain over a sufficient number to his views, he was compelled to retire from the contest. Several years after, David and Saadiah met at an entertainment given by one Cassad to all the respectable persons in the place; this happily resulted in a reconciliation between them, in consequence of which the mutual ban was revoked. Saadiah, however, returned no more to public life; but resigning his office and income to the person on whom in the meantime they had been bestowed, he devoted himself to the prosecution of his literary labours. His numerous productions,—which stamp him as the first rabbi, who united the qualities of the skilful philologist and sound interpreter to extensive Talmudical knowledge and a philosophic turn of mind,—may justify us in adding a few words concerning them.

Saadia was born in the province of Fayum in Egypt, in the year 892; his death took place in 942. He was very diligent in the prosecution of literary pursuits, and thereby earned for himself an enviable reputation, not only among his own people, but among the learned Arabs also. Masudi and other Arabian scholars his contemporaries mention him in terms of high respect.* In his capacity of Gaon, he greatly distinguished himself as a profound Talmudist, by his manner of deciding doubtful cases, on some of which he wrote entire treatises; he also did much towards arranging and establishing the Jewish ritual. As a philologist we find him the first who exhibited any thing approaching to a scientific treatment of the grammar and lexicography of the Hebrew language; although, as might be expected, the results he accomplished were little more than rude beginnings. His exegetical labors are of more importance; he made the well known Arabic version of the Pentateuch, Isaiah and Job which goes by his name, and whose critical value is very great. His philosophic spirit of inquiry is shown, not only in his translations and comments, but also in his celebrated treatise on Faith and Observances (אמונה ודעות);† in which he endeavors to reconcile Jewish belief with the teachings of philosophy, maintaining at the same time the truth of the former and the correctness of the latter. He divided his book under ten heads, each containing several chapters, which are as follows: 1, of the Creation of the World and all that it contains out of nothing; 2, of the Creator; 3, of his Command and Prohibitions, with the reasons therefor; 4, of Obedience and Disobedience; 5, of good and bad Actions; 6, of the Soul and Death, and of the State hereafter; 7, of the Resurrection; 8, of the Redemption of Israel; 9, of future Rewards and Punishments; 10, of Well-doing. Although Saadia is entitled to consideration as the first rabbi whose writings assumed a philosophic cast, his speculations are far inferior in value to those of Bechai, Judah Hallevi, Aben Ezra, or Maimonides. These latter formed a complete philosophical system, based on theology, and designed as a permanent support to and confirmation of the principles of re-

* See De Sacy's *Chrestomathie Arabe*, Vol. II. pp. 487, 495, first edition.

† This work, originally written in Arabic, was translated into Hebrew by Judah ben Tibon, 1186; and was printed at Amsterdam in 1562, and again in 1649, and in Berlin in 1789.

ligion ; but Saadiah's metaphysics were a mere polemic engine, employed by him for the defence of Judaism against the attacks of other religionists, especially Christians. He generally adhered to the literal sense of the sacred Scriptures, except in those cases where he considered it impossible so to do ; as for instance in the account of the serpent in the garden of Eden, and of Balaam's ass, to which he gave an allegorical interpretation. The soul he considered as endowed with a corporality distinct from the mortal body, and maintained that the rewards and punishments of the life to come would be adapted to the nature of such a being.

From the account we gave of the misunderstanding between Saadiah Gaon and David, it is evident that the secular power of the Resh Glutha as well as the spiritual authority of the Gaon were now in a state of rapid decline ; this was accelerated by the pride and tyranny of the former functionary, and by the diminished respect paid to the Talmud, in consequence of the prevailing devotion to philosophical and philological studies. The only successors that David had in the Gaonship were Sherira Gaon and his son Hai ; who were enabled to keep up the office a short time longer, by means of their extensive learning and the popularity they consequently enjoyed.

Sherira Gaon, a distinguished teacher in Pumbeditha, who flourished in the year 967, appears to have united in his own person the offices of Resh Glutha and Gaon, on the latter's becoming vacant ; this constituted him the sole head of the congregations. Afterwards, when enfeebled by age, he associated with himself his son Hai as co-regent. Being impeached before the reigning caliph, Ahmed Kadher, for some arbitrary exercise of power, Sherira and Hai were both condemned to imprisonment and loss of goods, and the former was sentenced to be hung up by the hand. (A. D. 997.) Hai, however, was liberated and restored to his office, which he filled about forty years longer. Sherira has left us a concise account of the distinguished scholars who flourished before him.

Hai Gaon was born 969 ; he was, as we have said, the son of Sherira Gaon, and was also son-in-law to Samuel ben Chofni a teacher in Sura. He successfully exerted all the influence of his birth and character to support the tottering authority of the Gaonship during his lifetime ; for the more inquisitive and enlightened minds in the community already began to cast off the authority of tradition, and with it that of the rulers by whom

the system was administered and upheld. Hai is one of the most interesting characters in Jewish literary history; he was a fertile author, and the influence of his doctrines on the moral condition of the Jews continued to operate long after his death. He seems to have fully comprehended the duties of a spiritual head, who, while careful to preserve the integrity of traditional dogmas, should not cling with slavish submission to their letter, but should seize their spirit, and adapt their requisitions to the demands of the age in which he lives. He made the decision, remarkable for the period, that traditional observances did not depend on the authority of the Talmud, but must be regulated by the opinion of the congregation of Israel, from which the Talmud itself derives its sanction; hence, he says: "Give to every man his own; and whatever the Agada may teach, if it be not consistent with sound reason, reject it." He was still somewhat inclined to mystical studies, as appears by his cabalistic writings. He died in the year 1038, and with him the office of Gaon expired.*

About this time occurred the dispute respecting the various readings of the Bible, between Aaron ben Asher of Tiberias and Jacob ben Naphtali of Pumbeditha; from which dates the general collection of such readings and their division into two classes, called after those who used them, Oriental and Occidental. From the period when the Jewish mind ceased to be fettered by the almost despotic power of their spiritual and secular rulers, other branches of knowledge, as philosophy, philology and poetry began to be cultivated among them, although long held subordinate to the study of the Talmud, and considered simply in the light of auxiliaries to the religious and moral teachings of the synagogue. The attention of the rabbies and other learned men of the time was accordingly directed for the most part to Talmudic explanations of the Scriptures, and to polemical treatises in defence of the Mosaic religion against Christianity and Islamism. Both these tendencies are visible in the writings of Saadiah Gaon, and especially in his celebrated work on Faith and Observances (see p. 160); they afterwards caused the production of the polemic colloquy, called the book *Cosri*

* His biography, with that of some other rabbies, has been elegantly written in Hebrew by the learned and much esteemed Rapoport of Lemberg, with the title *הולדות ר' נתן איש רומי*, *הולדות ר' סדעיה גאון וקורות ספריו וזג'*.

(*חבנה ולבנה*) by R. Judah Hallevi, the Book of Morals (*מורה נבוכים*) by Bechai, and above all Maimonides' master-piece, the Wanderers' Guide (*מורה נבוכים*). Their philology, which before had consisted almost exclusively of those endeavors to preserve a correct text that gave rise to the Masorah, began now to have for its principal object the critical elucidation of the Bible; as appears from comments written on its various parts in addition to separate treatises on lexicography and grammar. These latter were indeed composed after the manner of the Arabs, but without neglecting the distinguishing peculiarities of the Hebrew. The first Hebrew lexicon deserving the name was composed by Menachem ben Seruk in Spain; and upon it there are some critical remarks by Adonim ben Librat (called also Dannach) of Fez. Several grammatical and lexicographical works were written by Judah ben Kárish of Dura in Barbary; but a greater reputation is enjoyed by those of Judah ben David ibn Chiug of Fez, and the lexicographers Merinos (Merwan) ben Chasdai and Jonah ben Gannah (Abulwalid) of Cordova. The religious character that marks their philosophical productions is also discernible in their poetry, which was composed chiefly for devotional purposes, and among the principal authors of which are Isaac ben Chasdai, Joseph and Solomon ben Gabirol, Eliezer Hakkalev, etc.

HISTORICAL SKETCH OF THE RABBINICAL SCHOOLS IN SPAIN, AND OF THE COMPILATION OF THE LITURGY.

These various productions of the learned, in the tenth, eleventh and twelfth centuries, appeared chiefly among the Jews of Spain under the Moórish dynasty,—their literary activity being excited by that of the people with whom they lived. They studied the principles of Arabian grammatical and metrical science, and endeavored to apply them, as far as possible, to the cultivation of the Hebrew; whence arose the modern form of Hebrew poetry, comprising both metre and rhyme, which were entirely unknown to the ancients. But, notwithstanding the influence thus exerted on Hebrew cultivation by the literature of the Arabs, and the impetus given by it to the pursuit of other branches of knowledge, as medicine and astronomy, the study of the Talmud was by no means neglected; indeed the rabbies always considered it an imperative duty to obtain a familiar acquaintance with its contents, as affording the grounds on which their judi-

cial decisions must be based. This rendered necessary the establishment of rabbinical schools in Spain ; while it contributed not a little to their success, that the distance of this country from the East, together with the disturbed political state of that part of the world, rendered frequent journeys thither both difficult and dangerous.

The following occurrence, which took place as early as the time of Sherira Gaon, aided essentially in rendering the Spanish independent of the Oriental schools. Four rabbies of Cairo,—Hushiel, Moses, Shemarya and another whose name has not reached us—when on a voyage, were captured by a pirate and sold in different places. Shemarya was left in Alexandria ; but it was not long before his learning procured him the chair of rabbi in Cairo. Hushiel was sold on the coast of Tunis, and afterwards became head of a school in Cairwan ; while Moses with his little son Enoch was taken to Cordova. Moses' wife, who was on board ship with them at the time of their seizure, was compelled, in order to escape the pirates' insults, to seek a watery grave, having previously been assured of immortality by her husband. On his arrival at Cordova, the unfortunate rabbi went in his slave's dress to the synagogue where Rabbi Nathan was then delivering a lecture. Moses took occasion, at the close of the discourse, to offer a few remarks on some of the opinions expressed in it. The whole audience were astonished and delighted, and begged him to state his views more at length. He thereupon complied, exhibiting in the course of his observations extraordinary ingenuity and learning. At the conclusion of the service, some parties approached Nathan as usual, for the purpose of settling their disputes ; but he modestly exclaimed : “ I am no longer your judge ; this slave here is my master, and I am his pupil ; elect him to the office.” This was accordingly done, and Moses was assigned a considerable salary with a splendid carriage for his use. King Hashem readily confirmed the appointment, on being informed that the acquisition of this learned stranger would render his Jewish subjects independent of Eastern domination. From Moses justly dates the gradual rise and prosperity of the rabbinical schools in Spain ; indeed it is probable that they then, for the first time, became possessed of complete copies of the Talmud. The existence of this celebrated body of Jewish legislation coming to the knowledge of Hashem, he ordered Joseph ben Isaac Stanas, a pupil of Moses, to translate it into Arabic ; partly that he might him-

self examine its contents, and partly that his judges might acquaint themselves with the grounds of legal decisions among the Jews. The task was accomplished by Joseph to the sovereign's satisfaction. In this way the Spanish Jews became independent of foreign influence; and they were wont to take a natural pride in the possession of this venerated monument of the piety and erudition of their forefathers, in addition to the literary knowledge of their Arab neighbors, which they also strove to make their own. This honest pride was one of the principal characteristics of the Jews of the Peninsula; and it afterwards caused them to be distinguished, even under the most dreadful reverses, by an independence of spirit, a strictness of principle, and an ardor in literary pursuits, not possessed by the rest of their brethren in exile.

After the death of Moses and Chasdai, the Jewish community in Spain became separated into two parties, on the occasion of electing a spiritual head; one of them supporting the claims of Moses' son, Enoch, and the other those of Joseph Stanas, who, in consequence of his proficiency both in rabbinic and Arabic literature, considered himself entitled to the highest office in the gift of his people. After a long dispute, Enoch was proclaimed elected; and as Joseph Stanas still persevered in his opposition, sentence of excommunication was pronounced against him. Two brothers, silk manufacturers, named Jacob and Joseph Gav, who continued to exert themselves in his cause, succeeded by means of rich presents in gaining the favor of King Hashem. Jacob Gav was in consequence appointed secular chief of the Jews and successor to Chasdai. He immediately ordered Enoch to cease the exercise of his official functions, and authorized Joseph Stanas to fill his place. The latter, however, refused to accept the appointment, holding it unworthy of him to get the better of his opponent by such intrigues. Jacob, falling soon after under the king's displeasure, offered no further molestation to Enoch, who performed the duties of his office for fifteen years in a praiseworthy manner. At the expiration of this period (1015), he was accidentally killed by the falling in of the roof of the synagogue at the feast of tabernacles. Joseph Stanas died in obscurity at Damascus.

The next who distinguished himself, after Enoch, was Samuel Hallevi of Malaga, who resided in Grenada, and enjoyed the title of Prince (הנגיד). He was the first who undertook to systematize the materials of which the Talmud is composed.

His Introduction to the Talmud* shows him to have been a man possessed of clear and liberal views. He divided the Talmud into two parts, the Mishnah and the Gemara. The former comprises the traditions said to have been handed down from Moses himself; and this he subdivided into two parts, consisting of 1, the code of laws embraced in these traditions; and 2, the decisions of the learned on the minute points that had arisen for discussion in the lapse of ages. The second part includes later additions as well as tracts on legal topics of every kind; these Enoch considered as mere comments on obscure points, and consequently as of no authority except in so far as they agree with the dictates of reason and common sense. A still more important labor of this diligent scholar is his enumeration and classification of the various modes in which the Talmudic discussions are conducted; by means of which one is easily enabled to determine the principles on which the conclusions of the Talmud are arrived at. He wrote moreover a Hebrew Grammar and likewise some poetry; in addition to which he kept up a constant correspondence with Hai Gaon in Palestine, whose decisions he held in great respect. His death took place between the years 1050 and 1060.

Samuel was succeeded in his office by his son Joseph, a man equally conspicuous for natural abilities, but possessed of a stern, unbending character, which created general dissatisfaction; and notwithstanding his acknowledged generosity, he is also deeply censured by the rabbies. After being eight years in office, he was massacred or executed, in company with fifteen hundred Jews of respectability, for some cause or causes now unknown. Upon this dreadful catastrophe, the synagogue in Grenada was dissolved; and every Jew left the city, and sought a shelter elsewhere. Among the fugitives were two sons of Hiskiah, the Resh Glutha of Babylon, who had met in Spain with a kind reception on the part of Joseph. The latter's wife took refuge in Lucena, where a number of rabbies were collected together, and among them several of Joseph's friends and pupils. One of these, the rich and learned Isaac ben Geath, was at the head of the assembly. He, being under many obligations to his deceased friend, offered to confer the office of

* מבוטא החלמוד printed in the first tract of the Talmud, and separately published with a Latin translation by Basel Nuysen, under the title of "*Clavis Talmudica maxima*," Hanau, 1714.

chief rabbi on Joseph's son, Assariah ; but as the latter died shortly after his arrival there, Isaac was constrained to take it himself. Isaac ben Moses ben Sakhne, another of Joseph's pupils, taught at Deria ; but, undertaking a journey to Hai Gaon, he surrendered his place, which was supplied by Isaac ben Reuben of Barcelona. All these, and especially the last, distinguished themselves by their Hebrew poetical productions. A still greater man was Isaac ben Jacob ben Baruch, of the family of Albaliah, a pupil of Samuel and Joseph, and who formed a collection of their writings. He was in the service of Abulcastem ibn Abad Almuhammed, king of Seville, and was his counsellor and astrologer, besides being in high repute with his own people as a learned rabbi and poet.

These men, however, were all cast into the shade by the celebrated Isaac ben Jacob of Kaleth Hamam in Fez, called also Isaac Alfez, who, on coming to Spain, went first to Seville, then to Cordova, and finally settled in Lucena, where the above mentioned Judah ben Geath had just died. He was an admirable scholar and a man of a noble and generous disposition. His principal work, the *Halachoth*,* has given him an undying reputation. It consists of extracts of such parts of the Talmud as were still applicable (omitting the treatises on agriculture, on sacrifices, on cleanness and uncleanness, etc., now become obsolete), arranged in a more scientific order, and accompanied by a commentary. This collection, from the facility of reference afforded by its arrangement, was of singular utility to the rabbies ; while the elucidatory remarks accompanying it, formed a contribution to Jewish literature of no small value. The judicious critique, with which Zechariah Halleli enriched it, contributed to render it still more popular. Alfez died in his ninetyeth year (1163) universally lamented. The school at Lucena was maintained in a flourishing state after his decease, by his two favorite pupils, Joseph ben Megas and Baruch ben Albalial ; the former of whom was celebrated chiefly as a Talmudist, and the latter as a philologist and philosopher.

We will now revert to Chushiel, another of the four rabbies captured by the pirate, and who was taken to Cairwan, where he obtained the post of chief rabbi. This gives us occasion to mention his celebrated son and pupil, Chananel, ben Chushiel,†

* The principal editions are those of Constantinople, 1599, 3 vols. fol.; Cracow, 1597 ; Amsterdam, 1720 ; Sulzbach, 1764.

† His life is given by Rapoport, entitled חולדות ר' חננל.

who succeeded him in his office. He was born in the last quarter of the tenth century, and died 1050; hence he was a contemporary of Hai Gaon, Resh Glutha of Babylon, with whom he maintained a correspondence. Although the situation in which he was placed was far from giving him the extensive influence which Hai enjoyed, he much excelled the latter in the amount and value of his literary labors. He composed a commentary on the Pentateuch, which is characterized by a simple and sound style of exegesis, that favorably contrasts with the tendency of similar productions in his day. The independent and philosophic cast of his mind is shown to great advantage in his Talmudic writings. He was the first who composed a distinct work for the elucidation of the Talmud; this he conducted on a plan similar to that afterwards pursued by Isaac Alfez in his commentary. The author declares it as his opinion, that all such Talmudic narrations, as do not admit a natural and reasonable explanation, are to be regarded as mere allegories; and that prophetic visions, giving anthropomorphite views of the Deity, are simply the result of the writers' limited human conceptions. This was an important step; since the literal truth of these legends had hitherto been held indisputable; and the only mode of dealing with them had been either to modify them in part, so as to render them somewhat conformable to reason, or else to neglect them altogether. His ideas did not meet with a favorable reception from the learned of his own age; but in the subsequent one, they were held in the greatest esteem,—so much so that they were followed to a great extent by Isaac Alfez in composing the Halachoth, which, on account of its conciseness and the more favorable position of its author in the literary and influential community of Spain, soon surpassed the work of Isaac in popularity.

Contemporary with Chananel was Nissim ben Jacob; his father Jacob ben Nissim was chief rabbi in Cairwan before Chushiel, by whom he was succeeded. Chushiel and his son Chananel did not spring from the Arabico-rabbinical school, but first became acquainted with it during their stay in Africa. The case was different with Jacob and his son Nissim. The former had already composed a philosophical commentary on the Talmudic writings, as also on the tracts of Rabbi Eleizer (פרקי דר' אליזר), and on the book Jezirah.* The latter composed

* This book, which has not been translated into Hebrew, is to be published for the first time in the original Arabic in

a number of works, in which he endeavored to reconcile the discrepancies of the Babylonian and Jerusalem Talmuds. He was accustomed to write either in a mixture of rabbinical Hebrew and Arabic, or else in pure Arabic. His ethical work alone, which contains a number of Talmudic and Medrashic moral tales, has been translated into Hebrew, and published several times. He enjoyed great esteem and popularity in his day, so much so that he was honored with the title of Gaon, which however he would not consent to bear. He forms the connecting link between Hai Gaon and Samuel Hannasi.

All the writings of this period, although tinged with the more liberal and enlightened principles that were beginning to prevail, exhibit a profound reverence for the traditions contained in the Talmud. This respect for tradition was accompanied by a deep-seated feeling of piety, and by that devoted resignation to the will of God, which results from a full sense of his power and of human frailty and insignificance. But although this excessive self-abasement, originating in the holiest sentiments of our nature, has produced many misguided actions among the votaries of other religions, causing men to desert the sphere of activity allotted them, and convert themselves into monks, hermits and santons of the desert, it had but little effect on the outward conduct of the Jews, notwithstanding the oppressed and humbled condition in which they so long remained. Indeed there are but few of their writings in which any tendency of this sort appears; one such is the ethical work of Bechai ben Joseph, called the Duties of the Heart (فرعي القلوب), originally written in Arabic, and translated into Hebrew by Abram ben Chasdai, under the title of חבה הלבבית. The Duties of the Heart are so termed by him in contradistinction to those of the body; by the former he understands purity of thought and feeling, and by the latter the observance of commandments. He bitterly complained that no book had yet been written to inculcate those duties of the heart which form the true basis and essence of a pious life. "Heretofore," he says, "the sole endeavor has been to explain the most trifling observances enjoined by the law, and to find out decisions applicable to the most unusual and improbable occurrences; while those things in which true piety and morality mainly consist, have been utterly neglected." He

the promised Arabico-rabbinical Chrestomathy of M. Munk of Paris.

divides his book into ten chapters, the topics of which are as follows: 1, of the Unity of God; 2, of his Government and Preservation of the Universe; 3, of Resignation to God's Will; 4, of Confidence in God; 5, of Actions performed for God's sake; 6, of Meekness; 7, of Repentance; 8, of Self-examination; 9, of the Renunciation of worldly influences; 10, of Love to God. The spirit which pervades the whole performance clearly shows the influence of the Arabian sages, whose sayings he profusely quotes. The relations between God and man, as exhibited by him, are not those of the loving father and son, but of the gracious master and submissive servant: so that the predominant motive, held out for feelings and acts of piety, is a dread of opposing the will of God; and the most edifying contemplations are declared to be those of his might and majesty. Holding the belief that good actions are of value, only as exhibiting purity of feelings and obedience to the Supreme will, he gives them an Arabic name signifying *viatica*,—such being the provisions with which one should furnish one's self for his journey to the other world. The idea that the present life is but a state of preparation for that to come, he thus expresses: "This world is as an antechamber, in which thou art to prepare thyself for entering with propriety into the saloon."* It is clear that the doctrines of Bechai might easily have degenerated into those of total seclusion from the world, had not the practical tendency of Judaism effectually opposed such a result. Indeed he himself admits, that although such a religious retirement is not altogether unpraiseworthy, it is opposed to the spirit of the Bible;† adding, however, that it might still be permitted to some individuals, in order to form a standard of holy living for the rest. Although these doctrines were not fully adopted by the people, their effect must have been highly beneficial, at a period when the Jewish mind was rapidly tending to a gross materialism.

The intellectual advancement of the Jewish nation was next assisted by the labors of the celebrated Abraham ben Maier ben Ezra of Toledo, commonly styled Aben Ezra, in whose voluminous writings the sciences of philology and philosophy, although grounded as usual upon Talmudical learning, reached a much higher point of development than in those of any of his

* חסולם חזק דומה לפרזודר (πρόζυγος) חזקן עצמך לפרזודר כד שחכנס לסרבלין.

† Chap. IX. § 2, 3, 5.

predecessors. He was descended from one of the most respectable and learned families among the Jews of Spain ; and was alike distinguished in his own person for native genius and profound scholarship. Master of both Hebrew and Arabic, he was thoroughly versed in the Talmud and other rabbinical writings, and also in the Aristotelian philosophy then so much in vogue, besides possessing an acquaintance with mathematics and astronomy. His activity of disposition and ardor for inquiry led him to enlarge the bounds of his knowledge of men and things by foreign travel, in preference to remaining at home and occupying a teacher's chair. He thus extended his journeyings eastward to Italy, Greece, Palestine and other Oriental countries, and according to some as far as India ; and towards the close of his life he is known to have visited England. He yet found leisure, notwithstanding his migratory course of life, for the composition of numerous works in widely different branches of literature. Among his grammatical writings are those entitled *Mosnaim*, *Zachoth* and *Sepher Brura* ; in these he appears as the first scientific investigator of the etymologies of words and of the abnormal forms found in the Bible, with which he manifests a degree of minute familiarity that is truly extraordinary. Many ingenious and successful interpretations are also to be met with in these works ; but his exegetical productions are chiefly contained in his commentaries on the Pentateuch and various other parts of the Bible, and in them he exhibits extensive philological knowledge, sound critical judgment, and an uncommon freedom from Talmudical bias. His style is pure and condensed, often abrupt, and occasionally obscure, in consequence of his merely hinting at the ideas he wishes to convey, instead of expressing them at length.

Of the several modes of interpretation adopted by others and himself he speaks as follows : " Some, and especially those rabbies who reside among the Arabs, take occasion to connect the study of biblical interpretation with that of natural history and metaphysics ; but every one who desires to become acquainted with these sciences will do better to study them in books that treat of them alone. Others, as the Karaites, seek to explain all these matters from the Bible, and to establish them upon what is there contained. A third class, the Cabbalists, grope in total darkness, thinking to discover symbols in every part of the Law ; the errors of these men scarcely deserve a serious refutation, although in one respect they are right, viz. in asserting that all laws

are to be weighed in the balance of reason,—for in every heart is a mind which is a reflection of God's spirit, and when this is opposed to the literal acceptation of Scripture, a deeper meaning is to be looked for, reason being the messenger between God and man. If, however, the plain interpretation of a passage be not opposed to reason, why should we seek for any other? Notwithstanding, there *are* phrases which contain both a literal and an allegorical meaning, as for instance the terms 'circumcision,' 'the tree of knowledge,' etc. A fourth class explain every thing according to the Agada,* without regard to the laws of grammar; but what purpose is served by repeating the often contradictory views that have already been detailed in so many Talmudic writings? Some of these Agadic explanations have indeed a deeper meaning than appears on the surface; but the majority of them are designed merely as an agreeable relaxation for the mind when wearied by the study of the Halacha.† A fifth mode is that followed by myself: this is, first to determine the grammatical sense of a passage; next to consult the Chaldee version of Onkelos, although this, especially in the poetical portions, often departs from the simple meaning; and for the legislative books of the Bible I call in the aid of tradition."‡

As might be expected, from the views of interpretation here given, we find the commentaries of Aben Ezra full of sound judgment and acute criticism; his bold and original mind often spurning the beaten track pursued by the rabbies his predecessors, although not able to escape from their influence altogether. Indeed there seems to have been a constant struggle going on in his mind, between the deep-rooted impressions of childhood and the more enlarged views and correct opinions obtained by

* The Agada is that portion of the Talmud which consists of narrations, sayings and allegorical illustrations; while the Halacha comprises the discussions and decisions that have been made on the traditional laws.

† Sentiments similar to these are expressed in the preface to his Commentary on Lamentations. "The Agadic explanations," he says, "are of various kinds; some to elevate and refresh the mind, and some to furnish food for the weaker intellects: so that the literal sense of a verse is to be likened to the body, and its Agadic illustration to the dress, which is sometimes of fine silk, and at other times of sackcloth."

‡ Pref. to Com. on Genesis.

his extensive commerce with the world. Thus, at one time, his indignation is excited against writers who doubt or deny the authenticity of portions of the Bible ; and, being impressed with the conviction that the spread of such opinions would tend to overthrow the whole fabric of religious belief, he denounces the books containing them as worthy of being committed to the flames ;* while, at another time, he ventures to intimate that some passages of the Pentateuch are of later date than the rest, but bids the prudent keep silence respecting it ;† he also points out an error in the Book of Chronicles.‡ Again, he sometimes amuses himself with Cabbalistic trifling ; thus he finds holy symbols in the number of days, &c. of the festivals,§ and in the numbers of the letters composing the sacred name יהוה, concerning which last he wrote an entire treatise, called the Book of the Name (ספר השם).|| He also composed a number of poems in the modern form, with rhyme and metre, which show a happy invention and considerable richness of thought and language. In fine, his talents and labors were such as to entitle him to a very high place in the esteem of Jewish scholars ; and his works, many of which still remain unedited, are among the most remarkable monuments of Jewish erudition.

As a poet, however, Aben Ezra was far surpassed by Samuel ben Judah Gabirol, of Malaga in Spain, and Eliezer Hakkaler in Italy. Both of these literati distinguished themselves by their many poetical productions of merit, of which a great portion are preserved in the synagogue service of the present day. The Portuguese ritual is mostly composed of the sacred poems of Samuel Gabirol ; and the Italian, Polish, and German, of those of Eliezer Hakkaler. The remainder of this article we shall devote to an account of these productions.

THE JEWISH RITUAL.

The Jewish ritual has grown up from small beginnings to a great and multifarious mass, by the gradual accession of new pieces. The ancient Hebrews knew nothing of an order of

* At the end of Zachoth, and in his Commentary on Gen. 36: 30.

† Com. on Gen. 12: 6. 13: 7. ‡ Com. on Exod. 25: 29.

§ Com. on Lev. 23: 26.

|| First edited by Dr. Lippmann, Furth, 1834.

common prayer, their religious services consisting chiefly of sacrifices, which the individuals offering them were wont to accompany by an extempore prayer in the temple. But during the existence of the second temple, when various circumstances arose to weaken the unity of the Jewish faith, a necessity began to be felt for a set of religious exercises, more uniform and complete, and better adapted to their altered situation. To this end, formulæ of prayer and praise were composed from time to time by different teachers, for the use of the students in the seminaries of learning (בתי מדרש). These schools were afterwards converted into meeting-houses, or synagogues (בתי תפילה), in which the public merely took the part of auditors, listening in silence to the words of the reader, and accompanying the close of each petition with the ejaculation, *Amen*. The reader, who stood in front of the desk where the Law was kept, was called *חזן*; he generally used the appointed formulæ, but sometimes followed the impulse of his own feelings, and led the devotions of the congregation in extempore prayer. After the destruction of the second temple, with which the ancient service finally disappeared, the consoling influences of prayer in the nation's humbled state became more fully appreciated, and its exercise became more general among individuals and assemblies. By degrees, prayers for particular occasions, as Sabbaths and other festivals, acquired an obligatory character; and "the eighteen blessings" (שמונה עשרת הברכות) were ordered to be daily used in the private devotions of individuals not taking part in the public service of the synagogue.

The liturgy thus founded obtained the sanction of the Gaonim, whose spiritual authority was universally recognized, and who not only instituted the order of prayer in their own dioceses, but transmitted it to distant countries, to be used by the rest of the nation. The additions made to it from time to time are as diverse in character, as the individuals by whom they were introduced. Some are mere extracts from the Talmud, not originally intended to serve as prayers, and by no means adapted to devotional purposes; many again are written, not in Hebrew, but in Chaldee,—at that time the vulgar tongue. The liberty possessed by the Gaonim of making additions, especially of poems for the festivals of the Jewish church, was afterwards exercised by different rabbies, who in later times were the spiritual heads of the people. These additions, however, instead of being called forth by the circumstances of the times, or writ-

ten in a language which the people generally understood, were made up in a great measure of sayings from the Agada, with accounts of the festivals and other occasions on which they were employed. The evil was augmented by introducing the poems of Eliezer Hakkaler, which are chiefly of a didactic nature, and not at all calculated to excite feelings of devotion. When the people came, in process of time, to take an active share in the exercises of the synagogue, these pieces were recited aloud as unintelligible formulæ; for to understand them requires a knowledge of the Hebrew language and of the Agada, such as the mass of the people could not possibly possess. These defects are much less conspicuous in the ritual adopted by the Jews of Spain and Portugal, and which is chiefly compiled from the productions of Solomon ben Gabirol. This man, although he lived only till about his thirtieth year (between 1040-50 and 1070-80), distinguished himself by his philosophical treatise, entitled the Art of Improving the Mind (חִיקוֹן מִדּוֹת הַנֶּפֶשׁ); besides which he was an excellent commentator and poet. He founded and closely adhered to a strict system of metre and rhyme, and his religious poems are characterized by a biblical style and a truly poetic cast of thought; they comprise hymns (בִּקְשׁוֹת), prayers (חֲפִלוֹת), and elegies (קִנּוֹת), and are very numerous. In order to give a better idea of the character of his poetry than can be communicated by mere description, we will conclude with an extract or two from his compositions. The following verses, which, it will be perceived, consist of couplets of sixteen syllables each, form the introduction to his poem entitled the Royal Crown.

בְּחִפְזִי יִסְכֵּן-גִּבּוֹר • פִּי בָהּ יִלְמַד יִשְׂרָאֵל וְזִכּוֹת :
 סִפְרִתִּי בָהּ פְּלִאֵי אֵל חַי • בְּקִצְרָתָאֵךְ לֹא בְּאִרְכּוֹת :
 שִׁמְחִיתָ עַל רֹאשׁ מַחְלָלִי • וְקִרְאַתְךָ כְּחֵר מְלִכּוֹת :

By rehearsing my prayer, a man may benefit;
 For he may thereby learn purity and rectitude.
 Therein have I declared the wonders of the living God;
 Though briefly, and not at length.
 I have made it the first of my hymns of praise,
 And called it the Royal Crown.

This poem forms part of the Portuguese service for the Day of Atonement. The author begins by recounting, in glowing and highly poetical language, the adorable attributes of God; he describes his wonderful deeds in the creation of the world; and lauds his goodness in the formation of angels and men. He

mourns over the frailty and disobedience of mankind, and concludes with a confession of his own unworthiness and an humble supplication for divine mercy. This composition is not in verse, strictly speaking, but in a sort of rhymed prose, in imitation of the style adopted in the Koran and other ornate Arabic writings. We will give, as a specimen, the following description of the celestial inhabitants, which is quite in the Arabian manner.

יְהוָה מִי יַעֲמִיק לְמַחְשְׁבוֹתָיָהּ • בְּעֲשׂוֹתָהּ מִיּוֹ הַשְׁכִּינָה זֶהָר הַנְּשָׁמוֹת • וְהַנְּפֹשׁוֹת
הַרְמוֹת הֵם מְלָאכֵי רְצוֹנָה • מְשֻׁרְתֵי פְנֵיהָ • הֵם אֱהִי־רֵי כֵת וְגִבּוֹרֵי מַמְלָכָה • בְּיָדָם
לֵהֱטֵה הַחֶרֶב הַמַּחֲתֶּפֶכָה • וְעֵשֶׂת מְלָאכָה • אֶל אֲשֶׁר יִהְיֶה שְׁמָהּ הָרוּחַ לֵלְכָה • כָּל־
גְּזֵרוֹת פְּנִינִיּוֹת וְחַיּוֹת עֲלִיּוֹת • חֲצוֹנִיּוֹת וּפְנִימִיּוֹת • הַלִּיכוֹתֶיהָ צוּפִיּוֹת • מִמָּקוֹם
קָדוֹשׁ יִחַלְכּוּ • וּמִמָּקוֹר הָאוֹר יִמְשְׁכוּ • נַחֲלָקִים לְכַתּוֹת • וְעַל הַגִּלְגָּל אוֹתוֹת • בְּעֵט
סוּפֵר מְהִיר חֲרוּתוֹת • מֵהֶם נְסִיכוֹת וּמֵהֶם מְשֻׁרְתוֹת • מֵהֶם צְבָאוֹת • רְצוֹת וּבָאוֹת •
לֹא עֲרִפּוֹת וְלֹא נִלְאוֹת • רוֹאוֹת וְלֹא נִרְאוֹת • מֵהֶם חֲצוּבֵי לְהַכּוֹת • וּמֵהֶם רוֹחוֹת
נוֹשְׁבוֹת • מֵהֶם מַאֲשׁ וּמִמָּיִם מְרַבְּבוֹת • מֵהֶם שְׂרָפִים • וּמֵהֶם רְשָׁפִים • מֵהֶם בְּרָקִים •
וּמֵהֶם זִיקִים • וְכֹל־כֶּת מֵהֶם מְשַׁחֲחוֹת לְרוֹכֵב עֲרִבּוֹת • וּבְרוּם עוֹלָם נֹצְבִים
לְאַלְפִים וְלִרְבָּבוֹת • נַחֲלָקִים לְמִשְׁמְרוֹת • בְּיוֹם וּבַלַּיְלָה לְרֹאשׁ אֲשֻׁמְרוֹת • לְעֶרְוֶה
הַדּוֹלוֹת וְשִׁירוֹת • לְנֶאֱזֹר בְּגִבּוֹרוֹת • כָּל־כֶּת בְּחֶרֶדָה וְרִעָדָה • פּוֹרְעִים • וּמְשַׁחֲחוֹת
לָהּ • וְאוֹמְרִים מוֹדִים אֲנַחְנוּ לָהּ • שְׂאֵתָה הוּא יְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ • אֵתָה עֲשִׂיתָנוּ • וְלֹא
אֲנַחְנוּ • וּמַעֲשֵׂה יְדֶיךָ כָּל־נוֹ • וְכִי אֵתָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ • וְאֲנַחְנוּ עֲבָדֶיךָ • וְאֵתָה בּוֹרְאָנוּ •
וְאֲנַחְנוּ עֲבָדֶיךָ :

O Lord ! who can fathom the depth of thy thoughts, when thou didst form from the lustre of thy divine presence, the splendor of souls ; and the exalted spirits, even the angels who perform thy will, and minister in thy presence ; they are the excellent in power, and the mighty of the kingdom, in whose hand is the flaming sword, which revolveth. They perform their work, whithersoever thy Spirit directs them. They all are as polished rubies, exalted creatures ; the inner and the outer all view thy paths. They proceed from the holy place, and draw their existence from the fountain of light. They are divided into troops, according to their standards and ensigns, as engraven by the pen of the ready writer. Some of them are princes, and some servitors ; some in hosts run backwards and forwards, they are neither weary nor fatigued ; they see, but are not seen. Some are hewn from the flames ; some are waving winds ; some are compounded of fire and water. Some are as burning coals, some as flashes of fire, some as lightning, and some as sparks of fire. And every troop of them boweth down to him who rideth upon the heavens ; they all stand in the highest sphere, by thousands and ten thousands, divided into watches, observing both by night and by day the beginning of the watches, to arrange songs and praises to Him who is girt with mighty powers. They all with fear and trembling prostrate themselves, and worship thee, saying, We gratefully acknowledge unto thee, that thou art the Lord our God, thou hast made us, we are crea-

tures; and we all of us are the work of thy hands. Thou art our Lord, and we are thy servants; thou art our Creator, and we are thy witnesses.

The following extract, from the Additional Service for the same day, is in a more elaborate style, resembling that of Hariri and his Hebrew imitator Alcharisi. The reader will observe that, in addition to the ryhmes, the two last words of each clause of the Reader's portion form a close paranomasia.

ח' אֲרוּמָמָה חֹזְקִי וְחֵלְקִי • בְּבוֹאִי בְּרֵה דְבָקִי וְדַמְקִי • גַּם בְּשִׁמְכִי-זַעֲקִי וְצַעֲקִי •
 ק' בְּקִרְאִי עֲנֵנִי אֱלֹהֵי צִדְקִי • ח' הִרְשָׁתִּיךָ בְּשִׁמְשִׁי וְרִמְשִׁי • וְהֶאֱזִינָה לְחֹשִׁי וְרִחְשִׁי •
 וְחֶעֱבֵר-נָא יוֹקֵשִׁי וּמִוֹקֵשִׁי • ק' שׁוּבָה יְיָ חֲלָצָה נַפְשִׁי • ח' זֵרֶה נָא עוֹן אֲוִרְבִּי
 וְעוֹקְבִי • חֲבוֹשׁ מִחַץ עוֹצְבִי וְעוֹלְבִי • טִתֵּר סְגוּר לְבִי וְחוּבִי • ק' וְרִיחַ נֶכּוֹן חֲדָשׁ
 בְּקִרְבִּי • ח' יוֹם עֲמָדִיו בְּאַלְפִי וְטַפִּי • עֲבוֹשׁ יְהִי קִשְׁחַ עֲרִפִּי וְאַכְפִּי • לֵךְ אֲפִרוּשׁ
 כְּפִי וְאַפִּי • ק' וְשִׁפְתֵי רִנְנוֹת יִתְחַלְּלֶנּוּ

Read.—I will extol thee, O my Strength and my Portion; when I come in the ardency of my pursuit and my knocking; and when I pour forth my supplication and my cry. *Cong.*—"O God of my salvation, answer me when I call." *Read.*—I have sought thee at morn and evening-time: O give ear unto my humble supplication and prayer; and pardon now my iniquity and sin. *Cong.*—"Return, O Lord! and deliver [my soul]." *Read.*—Heal, I beseech thee, the iniquity of my insidious and treacherous appetites; bind up the wounds of my grief and affliction: O cleanse the caul of my sinful heart. *Cong.*—"And renew the spirit of rectitude within me." *Read.*—On the day that I thus stand, surrounded by old and young, subdue, O Lord! my obstinacy and perverseness; for unto thee do I spread forth my hand, and lift up my countenance. *Cong.*—"And with tuneful lips my mouth shall praise thee."

ARTICLE VIII.

REVIEW OF QUINCY'S HISTORY OF HARVARD UNIVERSITY.

By one of the Professors of Yale College.

The History of Harvard University, by Josiah Quincy, LL.D., President of the University. In two volumes. Cambridge: John Owen. 1840.

THIS history, from its subject, the high character and station of its author, its literary execution, and the circumstances under

which it comes before the public, prefers unusual claims to attention. It must, at first view certainly, be considered of indisputable authority as to all matters of fact; and destined as a work to be appealed to for the determination of all doubts, respecting any subject to which it relates. Time likewise will soon give it additional sanction; and, within a short period, it will be difficult, if not impossible, to question successfully its statements or its reasonings. Hence the importance of an early and free inquiry into its historical merits. If this history contains mistakes either as to facts, characters or motives, these mistakes can now be most easily corrected; and an attempt at such correction, if unsuccessful, so far from injuring, will strengthen its authority. We have no motive in making this production of President Quincy the subject of remark, but to determine, if possible, in a few instances, what is historical truth. For the author himself, and for the venerable institution over which he so honorably presides, we entertain no feelings, but those of respect; but parts of this history seem to impose on us the duty of suggesting our doubts as to their conformity to fact; and no objection to this course can, we suppose, arise from any quarter, provided in our comments we keep within the limits, and use the language, of fair and honest dissent.

It is by no means our intention or wish to enter on a general examination of the contents of these volumes. It is our object to look only at the allusions in this work to Connecticut, and more particularly the remarks on the origin and history of Yale College, in connection with a few other topics so closely allied to these, as not easily to be separated from them. Yale College President Quincy supposes to have owed its foundation and its characteristic features to a prevailing influence of the more rigid and strictly orthodox portion of the clergy and laity in Boston and the vicinity. Hence to exhibit more fully the character and operations of parties, at an early period, in the neighborhood of Harvard College, he has thought it necessary to mark some particulars in the rise and progress of the new institution in Connecticut; and Yale College has served the author the double purpose of illustrating the design and nature of domestic proceedings, and of giving greater prominence and of setting off more advantageously some bright parts of his picture by the strong aid of contrast.

The great fact alleged by President Quincy as the foundation of most of his reasoning respecting the religious parties in

Massachusetts, so far at least as they have been connected with the college at Cambridge, is this, that the college was established on the broad principles of religious liberality, as this species of liberality is now understood ; or to use his own language,* that "there is unquestionably a liberality of religious principle manifested in the several charters of this (Harvard) college, apparently irreconcilable with the general conduct and policy resulting from predominating religious opinions in that day." He supposes, that "among the early emigrants, there existed men who were true disciples of the great principles of the Reformation, and who even carried them to a degree of theoretic perfection, scarcely exceeded in our time." What reason there is for this assumption, we may find it necessary to inquire as we proceed ; at present, we advert to the fact merely, that such is his opinion, and that it is the foundation, upon which much of his superstructure rests. Two religious parties, it appears from President Quincy's narrative, early arose in Boston and the neighboring towns ; one of which was formed on the principles of liberality, to which we have already referred, and the other was composed of the representatives of the more rigid Puritans of the original stock. The latter, from opposition to Harvard, which was the chosen seat of catholicism, instigated the clergy of Connecticut, who were predisposed to have a college of their own, to found such an institution on principles entirely consonant with the peculiar religious views in which they both agreed. This party of strict Calvinists in Massachusetts, therefore, must be considered the real founders, and, in an important sense, the efficient patrons and supporters of the seminary, which was afterwards called Yale-College. This seems to be the obvious inference from the story told, and it appears to have been so understood by some who have commented on this history.

It is a matter of some curiosity to trace the progress of events in Connecticut, as represented in this work, from the settlement of the colony to the founding of its college. "The first settlers of Connecticut," we are told, "had emigrated from Massachusetts for the purpose of being under a stricter form of worship, than they could here attain." Of this assertion we look in vain for any proof. The first settlers of Connecticut certainly did not emigrate for the purpose of forming a closer connection between their religious and civil concerns. In Massachusetts,

* Vol. I. p. 49.

the "members of the church" only were "freemen of the state." In Connecticut, by the constitution of government adopted in 1639, neither church-membership nor property was a necessary qualification for voting at elections. Among the reasons assigned by Mr. Hooker and his congregation, as recorded by Governor Winthrop, and which, unless the contrary should appear, we ought, in the exercise of liberality, to admit as the true reasons, no mention is made of any wish, inclination, or "purpose of being under a stricter form of worship." The objections, likewise, which were made to the removal of the emigrants to Connecticut, imply no such design on their part. It was said, "that in point of conscience, they (Mr. Hooker and his congregation) ought not to depart from us, being knit to us in one body, and bound by oath to seek the welfare of this commonwealth. There is here something very like a denial, that there had been any dissension, or difference of opinion on any important subject, between those who wished to emigrate, and those who wished them to remain in Massachusetts. The only question seems to have been, whether the party about to remove to Connecticut could conscientiously separate themselves from those, with whom they were "knit in one body." If there had been any disagreement in religious belief or practice as the occasion of this removal, it must have been known to Winthrop, and we should find some notice of it in his faithful chronicle. But their purpose was, we are told, to be "under a stricter form of worship," than they could attain to in Massachusetts. We are not certain that we correctly understand this language. In any sense, however, which it can bear, if it describes the object of the emigrants, they appear, on their arrival at their place of destination, to have entirely forgotten their errand. As to the "form of worship," as this phrase is generally understood, it was, as far as we can ascertain, identical in both colonies. If there was any such diversity of opinion on points of theology and church polity, as to induce the removal to Connecticut, we know not where to find the proof of it; and we cannot but think, that President Quincy is chargeable with an oversight in making so novel a statement without reference to his authorities. We are inclined to believe, that this motive to the first colonization of Connecticut is to be placed in the same catalogue with that assigned by Robertson, who says, that "the rivalry between Mr. Cotton and Mr. Hooker, disposed the latter, who was least successful in this contest for fame and

power, to wish for some settlement at a distance from a competitor, by whom his reputation was eclipsed."

If we were to speculate on this subject, we should say, judging from what the emigrants did in their new commonwealth, that they wished to adopt a less rigid and a less exclusive form of government, rather than that they were desirous of "being under a stricter form of worship." In the principles of the government which they instituted, they departed greatly, as before stated, from what they left in Massachusetts; but in their form of worship, we know of no evidence that they made the slightest variation. In the colony of New-Haven, indeed, the Massachusetts principle of suffrage was at first adopted, but after about twenty-five years, it was abandoned; and this, thirty years before the charter of Massachusetts, granted by William and Mary; by which the people of that province, in their political institutions, became in part conformed to the more free and liberal system of their neighbors. But we have here no business with conjecture. According to Winthrop, the "principal reasons" for the removal of the new colony to Connecticut were "their want of accommodation for their cattle," "the fruitfulness and commodiousness of Connecticut, and the danger of having it possessed by others, Dutch or English," and though last, we presume, not least, "the strong bent of their spirits to remove thither." Any attempt to look beyond these reasons, and to discover others more recondite, and especially such as throw some discredit on the enterprise, we consider altogether gratuitous.

But President Quincy proceeds: "A desire had long existed in that colony (Connecticut) for the establishment in it of a "school of the prophets," constructed with reference to their peculiar religious views. To this object the crisis of affairs in Massachusetts was deemed favorable, and measures were adopted for founding such an institution in the neighborhood of New-Haven." It is true, that Mr. Davenport very early had a project for establishing a college in the colony of New-Haven, and some funds were collected for this purpose; but it was urged in opposition to his favorite scheme, and evidently on good grounds, that one such seminary was, at that time, enough for New-England, and the design was not prosecuted. Both Connecticut and New-Haven united cordially in the support of the college at Cambridge, and their contributions, as will appear more fully hereafter, were proportioned to their

ability. But the plan of building up a college in Connecticut was never abandoned ; it was merely postponed to a period, when the increase of population and of wealth should render its execution more necessary and practicable. But when, or where, the proposed seminary was denominated by the Connecticut clergy the "school of the prophets," or as President Quincy calls it in another place, the "school of the church," we know not. If the author intended here to intimate, that this appellation was selected as more exactly descriptive of the object of the proposed institution, and that it is language which in any degree characterizes the clergy of Connecticut at that period, he is altogether in error. There is no document, with which we are acquainted, proceeding from any public body, either ecclesiastical or civil in Connecticut, which gives this name of "school of the prophets," or that of "school of the church" to a college. Mr. Davenport aimed to establish "a college," which should be, "for the education of youth in good literature, to fit them for public service in church and commonwealth." Similar phraseology is used in the first charter of Yale College. "School of the church" was proposed in a plan drawn up evidently in Boston, as a name to be given to the projected institution in Connecticut, and individuals may have adopted this language from that source, but it is not the language of official papers.

But what were the "peculiar religious views" of the clergy of Connecticut, to which President Quincy refers, in conformity with which they were desirous of constructing their college? That there was any peculiarity in their religious views applicable to this case, in the sense in which the author intends, is, so far as we know, without proof. They had united cordially with their brethren in Massachusetts in the proceedings of the synod at Cambridge in 1649 ; nor does it appear from the Saybrook Confession of Faith, adopted in 1708, that any such change, in the mean time, had occurred, as to give the least countenance to the supposition, that "peculiar religious views" were entertained by them. It is certain that among the reasons publicly assigned for instituting a college in Connecticut, there is no mention of any diversity of theological opinions. If there were religious parties in Massachusetts, it is not improbable that there were those in Connecticut who more or less sympathized with them ; but that the stricter part of Calvinists in Massachusetts had a predominant influence in Connecticut

is a point not easy to establish ; as we think will appear clearly in the sequel.

The narrative proceeds : “ Among the firmest adherents to the doctrines of the early New-England churches, were Sewall, afterwards Chief Justice, and Addington, then secretary of state. They were both statesmen of the old charter caste, in whom the characters of politician and theologian were combined in nearly equal proportions. Both were dissatisfied with the state of things in Harvard college. Both were zealous and vigorous defenders of the doctrines of the early Congregational church. To these statesmen the clergy of Connecticut applied for the draft of a charter for their proposed institution ; and received from them an instrument, not founded, like the charters of Harvard, on ‘ the instituting, guiding and furthering of the said college, and the several members thereof, from time to time, in piety, morality and learning,’ but on something which they, doubtless, deemed more safe and scriptural, ‘ the reciting *memoriter* the ‘ Assembly’s Catechism’ in Latin, Dr. Ames’s ‘ Medulla,’ and also his ‘ Cases of Conscience,’ accompanied on the Sabbath by expositions of practical theology, and the repeating of sermons by the undergraduates ; and on week days by reading and expounding the Scriptures according to the laudable order and usage of Harvard College.”

That Chief Justice Sewall and Secretary Addington inserted an article of this kind in their draft of a charter has not before, we believe, been made public in any printed work. President Quincy must have had a copy of their draft, which he probably found among the papers of Judge Sewall. The article, however, referred to, differs widely from the above representation of it, and in the original paper is as follows :

“ And whereas the principles of the Christian Protestant religion are excellently comprised in the Confession of Faith composed by the Reverend Assembly of Divines sitting at Westminster, and the learned and judicious Dr. Ames in his *Medulla Theologiæ*, the Rector of the said school is to give in charge and take special care, that the said books be diligently read in the Latin tongue, and well studied by all scholars educated in the said school.” Here it will be noticed, that there is nothing about “reciting *memoriter* the Assembly’s Catechism,” nothing about Ames’s “Cases of Conscience,” nothing about “expositions of practical theology,” or “reading and expounding the Scriptures.” President Quincy adds : “The founders of the col-

lege in Connecticut adopted, without any material alterations, the draft made by Sewall and Addington." The reader is thus left necessarily to infer, that what, as he says, was proposed by Sewall and Addington, was included in the charter granted by the legislature of the colony; for no one could imagine, that President Quincy would consider the omission of that, to which he has given such prominence, as no "material alteration." Thus the author has not only given a representation of the article differing greatly from the fact, but has left an impression respecting the charter still more erroneous. *The article was entirely rejected;—the charter contains no trace of it whatever.*

That the subject of this charter may be fully understood, it is necessary to give a short narrative of facts respecting its origin. While the clergy of Connecticut in 1700 were deliberating on the plan of a college of their own, a communication was made to them, entitled "Proposals for erecting a University in the renowned Colony of Connecticut, humbly offered by a hearty, though unknown, well-wisher to the welfare of that religious Colony." This paper contained a plan of a college to be erected by a general synod of the consociated churches of Connecticut. The synod was to have influence in all elections, so far as should be necessary for the preservation of orthodoxy. This college was to be called the "school of the church," and numerous regulations were proposed for its management. These proposals were sent to the Rev. Mr. Noyes of Stonington, the Rev. Mr. Buckingham of Saybrook, and the Rev. Mr. Pierpont of New Haven. They were evidently not of Connecticut origin, and there is no place from which they could, with so much probability have come, as from Boston. From the coincidence of language and views in this project with what appears in the letters of Sewall, there is no room to doubt that he was in some way concerned in framing it. Addington may have lent his aid in devising and forwarding these "proposals," and, for aught we know, Cotton Mather likewise.

But this scheme, by whomsoever projected, found no favor in Connecticut. We can discover no evidence that any effort was made to carry it into execution, or that it was approved of by a single individual. This paper, though in form anonymous, was undoubtedly known to have come directly or indirectly from Sewall and others of his party; which fact might have led to the subsequent correspondence. In the mean time, the clergy of Connecticut had designated ten of their number to stand as

“trustees or undertakers to found, erect and govern a college.” These ten clergymen met and proceeded to execute their commission. They constituted themselves a “*quasi* corporation,” as they believed themselves to have a right to do by common law. They soon, however, concluded that it was expedient to have a charter from the colonial legislature, and as they had been in correspondence with Judge Sewall, though they had rejected the “Proposals,” they invited him and Secretary Addington to send them a draft of such an instrument, as might suit their purpose.

While the legislature was in session in New-Haven in October, 1701, “a large number of ministers and others” petitioned, that “*full* liberty and privilege might be granted to the said undertakers” to erect a “collegiate school.” After the subject had been fully discussed, and as it appears, every important point had been settled, the draft, which had been solicited, arrived. The letter inclosing it was not dated, as President Quincy infers, “about the end of 1700 or the beginning of 1701,” but the 6th of October of the latter year; three days only before the charter actually agreed upon received the legislative sanction. The date of the charter is October 9th, 1701. That the draft should have been brought from Boston to New-Haven, at that time, in three days, is sufficiently remarkable; but that it should in this short space have been conveyed such a distance, been fully considered by the trustees, and have passed through the forms of legislation, is explicable only on the supposition, that all the principles of the charter had been before discussed and determined on, and that all, which was necessary on the arrival of the draft from Boston, was the final legislative action. This is made certain by a comparison of the draft of Sewall and Addington, with the charter which was adopted.

In the draft from Boston there are three things, and but three, which mark it as at all peculiar. These are, the legislature made the founder of the college; the board of trustees is made to consist of both clerical and lay members; and the teaching of the Assembly’s Catechism and Ames’s Medulla is made imperative. In the letter accompanying the draft, Sewall and Addington recommend the introduction of some kind of “visitation,” which, in their view, would be “exceedingly proper and beneficial.” It is remarkable, that the trustees adopted not one of these suggestions, thus showing most conclusively, that they had a plan of their own, and that their correspondence with gen-

tlemen in Boston had no influence on their final determination. This will appear if we look more particularly at the documents. In Sewall and Addington's draft, the language is: "Be it enacted by the Governor and Company, &c., that there be a collegiate school forthwith founded and set up, &c." In the charter it is: "Be it enacted, &c., that there be, and hereby is, full liberty, right and privilege granted unto the Rev. Mr. James Noyes, &c., proposed to stand as trustees, partners, or undertakers for the said school, to them and their successors, to erect, form, direct, order, establish, improve, and at all times, in all suitable ways, for the future, to encourage the said school, &c." It is evident that the trustees wished to be themselves the founders, and acted on the principle, that, "a *license* to found, and a *charter of incorporation* are in their own nature distinct." The legislature likewise, in a subsequent clause, recognize the school as already founded in fact. This was thought by the original trustees, and it has been thought by others since, a very important point, and in reference to it they received no aid from Sewall and Addington. This matter must have been fully settled before the arrival of the draft. The same is true of the provision in the act of the legislature, which limits the trustees in the choice of successors to "ministers of the gospel;" in the draft there was a clause for the admission of lay members. The rejection of the article respecting the Assembly's catechism and Ames's Medulla has been already mentioned. The recommendation of a board of visitors was rejected likewise. The trustees undoubtedly considered such a board as a piece of cumbrous machinery, fitted to embarrass, rather than facilitate their operations. In this they judged right; and the present generation can hardly be sufficiently grateful, that the founders in this respect took the plain path of common sense. However useful a board of overseers may have been at Harvard, and on this point we are wholly incompetent to give any opinion, at Yale it would have been the ruin of the institution. The college never could have survived the disputes and divisions, which such a body, as it must have been constituted, would have excited and perpetuated in its concerns.

Perhaps it may be asked here, what use of Sewall and Addington's draft did the trustees make? As it arrived obviously at the last moment, in which it could be used at all, the trustees, probably that they might not appear entirely to neglect their Boston friends, took the preamble of the draft, not however

without important verbal alterations ; and they took also several other clauses usual in such instruments, but varying and improving the language throughout. They were indebted to this communication, so far as we can discover, for no principle, suggestion or hint, which altered their original purpose. The trustees were, without doubt, willing to receive the advice of others, and to give it full consideration ; but the college was one of their own designing, and was modified in no respect, either in its form or character, by any foreign counsel or interference. So far also was the favor of the "stricter sect of Calvinists" in Boston from being, as President Quincy supposes, "an element of worldly prosperity and success" to the new institution, that while very considerable sums were received by Harvard from Connecticut, not a shilling was received for more than a century by Yale from any part of Massachusetts ; nor do we find any evidence, that a single student from the eastern part of Massachusetts came to Yale college, for more than forty years after its establishment. Those also, who first entered from that quarter, did so, much against their own inclination and the earnest desire of their friends ; having been denied admittance into Harvard College, on account of their religious opinions. We shall have occasion to go into some detail on this subject hereafter. But does not President Clap say, that the legislature "established the act or charter drawn up by Mr. Secretary Addington, with some small additions and alterations ?" He does say so ; and hence probably President Quincy's mistake ; though, as he seems to have had both the draft and the charter under his eye, we are surprised that he did not notice the great difference of the two documents. How President Clap should have expressed himself as he does, we are unable to explain. Some of these variations involved principles, which he certainly considered of the utmost importance. Others, besides President Quincy, relying on the wonted accuracy of President Clap, have adopted his account, evidently without examination. But how far this account is accordant with fact, any one can judge for himself from the above comparison of the two papers.

But it will be said, that though President Quincy's representation of what Chief Justice Sewall and Secretary Addington proposed to be made, and of what was made, a part of the charter of the college in Connecticut, is erroneous, yet it is not very inaccurate, as an account of the first rules adopted by the trustees for the management of the seminary. This is true ;

and President Quincy seems to have made his statement, with President Clap's History of Yale College, or Trumbull's History of Connecticut before him ; in both of which works the directions for religious instruction are expressly mentioned as rules of the trustees, and in neither is there any intimation, that they were enjoined by the charter. The trustees ordered, that the Rector "shall take effectual care, that the said students be weekly, at such seasons as he shall see cause to appoint, caused *memoriter* to recite the Assembly's Catechism in Latin, and Ames's Theological Theses, of which, as also Ames's Cases of Conscience, he shall make, or cause to be made, from time to time, such explanations, as may, through the blessing of God, be most conducive to their establishment in the principles of the Christian Protestant religion." They ordered likewise, that "the Rector shall cause the Scriptures daily, except on the Sabbath, morning and evening, to be read by the students at the times of prayer in the school, according to the laudable order and usage of Harvard College, making exposition upon the same : " and upon the Sabbath, that he "shall either expound practical theology, or cause the non-graduated students to repeat sermons." President Quincy supposes that the mention of the "order and usage of Harvard College" had reference to the "expounding" of the Scriptures by the President, which had there fallen into some neglect : and that Sewall and Addington were particularly instrumental in having this matter put right in Connecticut, and wished to have it secured by charter. It will be seen, however, by looking at the article which they prepared for the charter, that there is no allusion to this matter of "expounding ;" and in the order itself, the reference to the "laudable usage of Harvard College" is restricted to the reading of the Scriptures "by the students at the times of prayer." That Sewall and Addington took an interest in this subject is true. In their letter to the trustees in which their draft of a charter was inclosed, they say : "we make no doubt you will oblige the Rector to expound the Scriptures diligently morning and evening." If they had thought it expedient that a provision to this effect should be included in the charter, their article would have contained it.

In establishing the regulations mentioned above, it was, without doubt, one great object of the trustees, to satisfy the public at the outset, as to the course of religious instruction, which was to be pursued in the new Collegiate School. To

effect this, they seem to have judged it expedient, to conform their seminary in this, as well as in other respects, as far as was in their power, to the older college at Cambridge. If they wished to satisfy their correspondents in Boston, as to charter provisions on this subject, the manner of doing it was somewhat equivocal; as Sewall and Addington would see, that their favorite points were secured in no other way, than they were at Cambridge; with the state of things at which place, according to President Quincy, they were dissatisfied. That the rules adopted by the trustees were merely a transcript of those at that time in force in Harvard College, there is abundant proof in these volumes.

In the ninth chapter of this work, we have a general view of "the course of studies and the degree of literary instruction" in Harvard in the early period of its history. "The exercises of the students," we are told, "had the aspect of a theological, rather than a literary institution. They were practised *twice a day in reading the Scriptures*, giving an account of their proficiency and experience in practical and spiritual truths, accompanied by theoretical observations on the language and logic of the sacred writings. They were carefully to attend God's ordinances, and be examined on their profiting; commonplacing the sermons and *repeating them publicly in the Hall*." It is added: "in every year and every week of the college course, every class was practised *in the Bible and catechetical divinity*." A sketch is likewise given of the course of study in other departments of learning; and it is then said: "such were the principles of education established in the college under the authority of Dunster. Nor does it appear, that they were materially changed during the whole of the seventeenth century;" that is, to the time of the founding of Yale College.

In the year 1723, various inquiries were made by the board of overseers respecting the state of the college, more particularly in reference to its religious and moral condition. These inquiries were arranged under ten different heads; two of which only are immediately to our purpose. The third inquiry was: "How are the Saturday exercises performed, and are the great concerns of their souls duly inculcated on the youth?" To this it was replied, that the *Greek Catechism* is recited by the Freshmen without exposition. Wollebius's and Ames's *Systems of Divinity* by the other classes with exposition on Saturdays; and *repetitions of the sermons* of the foregoing Sabbath are made by the

students on Saturday evenings, when the president is present." The fifth inquiry was: "Whether the Holy Scriptures be daily read in the hall, and how often expounded?" It was answered, "that the Scriptures are read in the hall, on Mondays, Tuesdays, Wednesdays and Thursdays, when the president is present, and once a week *expounded by the president*." Previous to 1708, the practice of obliging the undergraduates to read portions of the Scriptures from Latin or English into Greek, at morning or evening service, had been discontinued. On the accession of President Leverett, this "ancient and laudable practice was revived." In an official report of the regular exercises of the students, in 1726, "Wollebius's Divinity" and "Ames's Medulla" have a conspicuous place.*

Let the reader now compare this system of religious instruction with that of Yale College, as stated above, and he will see they are the same, with very few and immaterial variations. This is what might have been expected. All the trustees, with the exception of the Rev. Mr. Buckingham of Saybrook, were graduates of Harvard. They evidently retained a strong regard for their *Alma Mater*, and in bringing into operation their new college, were disposed to make Harvard their pattern, as far as circumstances would permit. It is an important fact illustrative of their feelings towards the older seminary, that they established no general laws, or very few, for the government of the students, for more than forty years after the founding of the college. The rector and tutors were referred to the laws and usages of Harvard College for their guide. Here is no evidence of disaffection, no indication of a feeling of opposition to the college at Cambridge. The trustees adopted a system with which they were familiar, in which they had themselves been educated; and they appear to have thought, that there was no way in which they could so effectually recommend the rising institution to the public, as by copying after one, in which there was such general confidence.

In the theological course, adopted first at Cambridge, and afterwards in the college of Connecticut, we see nothing very peculiar. Is not the Scotch Confession the ground of all theological instruction, in the universities of Scotland; and the thirty-nine articles in the universities of England? The church catechism is, we believe, taught, if not in the universities, in the

* Vol. I. p. 439—441.

great schools of the kingdom, in some portions of each in Latin, and in others, perhaps, in Greek. Among the first regulations made by the trustees of William and Mary College in Virginia, was this, that in the grammar school attached to the college all the scholars should learn the church catechism, in the English language, and that those who were more advanced in their studies should learn it in Latin.* It was likewise ordered, that on Saturdays and holydays, lessons should be set in Castalio's Dialogues, or Buchanan's version of the Psalms, or some other book of religious instruction, approved of at least by the president and master, to be recited in the morning on Mondays, and days next after the holydays.† In New England the Westminster catechism was the undisputed standard of orthodoxy; and Ames and Wollebius were considered two of the most able expounders of the same system. The Assembly's catechism in Latin, we believe, has been recited likewise in the college of New Jersey.

That there was in 1700 some opposition in Boston to Harvard, is clearly proved by what President Quincy has published. But that this opposition took a decided form in Connecticut is without proof. The strongest testimony to this point adduced by President Quincy is found in an extract of a letter from the Rev. Moses Noyes of Lyme, to Judge Sewall, in 1723. He says "it was a wrong step when the trustees, by the assistance of great men, removed the college from Saybrook, and a worse, when they put in Mr. Cutler for rector. The first movers for a college in Connecticut alleged this as a reason, because the college at Cambridge was under the tutelage of latitudinarians; but how well they mended, the event sadly manifests."‡ That the language of the disaffected in Boston should be repeated to some extent in Connecticut, when the establishment of the new college was in agitation, was a matter of course. But the testimony of Mr. Noyes ought to be received with some

* Curabit etiam ludi-magister, ut Catechismum Anglicanum linguâ vulgari omnes addiscant; proveciores etiam in Linguâ Latinâ.

† Diebus Saturni et profestis, lectio præscribatur sacra ex Castalionis Dialogis aut Buchanani Psalmorum Paraphrasi, aut quocunque alio libro pio, a præside et ludimagistro saltem comprobato, quæ diebus Lunæ et post festa mane reddatur.

‡ Vol. II. p. 462.

grains of abatement. Mr. Noyes lived in the neighborhood of Saybrook, was himself one of the trustees, and had at first opposed the removal of the college from that town. Having been defeated in his efforts, and having reluctantly given his assent to the proposed measure, in this letter to Judge Sewall, he evidently wrote with the feelings produced by recent disappointment. The real disposition of the original trustees towards Harvard is to be looked for rather in their treatment of Judge Sewall and Secretary Addington, which was barely civil, and in the uniform regard which they manifested to that institution. In 1725, the trustees, Mr. Noyes being absent, by a *unanimous* vote invited the Rev. Mr. Wigglesworth, Hollis Professor of Divinity in Harvard College, to the office of rector; and as he declined the place, private negotiations were immediately commenced with Mr. Henry Flynt, a tutor in the same college, to induce him to become rector of Yale. This attempt was likewise unsuccessful. These proceedings show, how little real apprehension there was then at New-Haven, Mr. Noyes's letter notwithstanding, about the theology of the "latitudinarians" at Cambridge. One half of the original trustees were in the board, at the time Mr. Cutler was elected rector; and three of the number, at the election of Professor Wigglesworth.

But it may be useful to look a little more closely at the theological course in the college of Connecticut, so particularly noticed by President Quincy, and compare it with that of the college at Cambridge. The trustees of the former directed that the students should recite the Assembly's Catechism *memoriter* in Latin. In the latter, every class was practised every year, and every week of the college course in *catechetical* divinity. The catechism was recited by the Freshmen in Greek, and without doubt *memoriter*. What more probable, than that the "Catechism of the Assembly of Divines at Westminster" was the catechism in question. This catechism was in the highest repute in Massachusetts, as well as in Connecticut, was universally taught in families; and if "catechetical divinity" made a part of the college course, what other manual would have been adopted in preference to that of the Westminster divines? We have now before us a copy of the Assembly's Catechism, in Greek and Latin, which was used in several successive classes in Yale College. What other catechism in Greek was there, which could have been used at Harvard? Yale College, then, in using this catechism, imitated

Harvard. At Harvard, the catechism was recited by the Freshmen in Greek, at Yale, by all classes in Latin; a difference, the importance and ground of which, we will not undertake to determine.

At Yale, "Ames's Theological Theses" were recited; at Harvard, "Ames's System of Divinity." "Ames's Medulla" is meant in both cases. It seems, that at Harvard, previous to 1723, Wollebius had been called in as an auxiliary to Ames. In Yale College, about the same time, the "Compendium Theologiæ Christianæ" of Wollebius was a text-book; proving, what before, perhaps, was sufficiently evident, that the course of studies in the latter institution was regularly conformed to that of the former. At Yale, the students heard explanations of "Ames's Cases of Conscience;" at Harvard, they gave an account of "their proficiency and experience in practical and spiritual truths," were required "to attend God's ordinances, and be examined on their profiting." The actual process in the two cases was probably nearly the same. We can see here, however, no indications of any "stricter form" in Connecticut, than in Massachusetts. As to reading and expounding the Scriptures, and repeating sermons, the course in the two colleges was the same. Why "the college in Connecticut began to be deemed by the stricter sect of Calvinists the stronghold of their opinions" does not appear. If in Harvard, a "catholic and liberal spirit" was "its vital principle and distinguishing characteristic,"—and we are not now questioning the fact,—what proof has been yet presented, that the same spirit did not exist in Yale?—If in Harvard there was no "form of sound words," no "creed," no "catechism," no "medulla theologiæ" "established as a standard of religious faith, to which every one, entering on an office of government and instruction, was required to swear and subscribe, and, at the hazard of perjury and hypocrisy, under the combined temptations of loss of place, of caste and of bread, at stated periods to renew his oath and subscription,"—neither was there at Yale. If the regulations of Harvard show no "shackle for the human soul," neither do the regulations of Yale show any such thing there. If "the first constitution of Harvard College, established in 1642, in enumerating the powers granted and the objects proposed to be attained by its foundation, makes use of these simple and memorable terms:" "To make and establish all such orders, statutes and constitutions, as they shall see necessary for the instituting,

guiding and furthering of the said college, and the several members thereof, from time to time, in *piety*, morality and learning ;" the first charter of Yale College authorizes the establishment of a school, " wherein youth may be instructed in the arts and sciences, who through the blessing of Almighty God may be fitted for public employments both in church and civil state." If there is proof of a " catholic spirit" in the one case, why not in the other ?

But perhaps at Yale, in elections, inquiry was made as to the belief of individual candidates. How was it at Harvard ? In 1737, when the Rev. Mr. Holyoke of Marblehead was a candidate for the Presidency, Governor Belcher is related* to have inquired of the Rev. John Barnard : " Can you vouch for Mr. Holyoke's Calvinistic principles ?" To which question Mr. Barnard replied : " If more than thirty years intimacy, and more than twenty years living with him, and scores of times hearing him preach can lead me into the knowledge of a man's principles, I think Mr. Holyoke as orthodox a Calvinist as any man ; though I look upon him as too much of a gentleman, and of too catholic a temper to cram his principles down another man's throat." " Then," said his excellency, " I believe he must be the man." And *accordingly* he was the man, and was elected in both boards unanimously. We suppose, that in the selection of the ten clergymen who composed the first board of trustees in Yale College, satisfactory evidence was required that each individual was " as orthodox a Calvinist as any man," and that all, or most, of this board were not of as " catholic a temper" as President Holyoke we have no reason to believe. The Rev. Timothy Woodbridge of Hartford, one of the first trustees, certainly sympathized with the party in Boston, considered as liberal by President Quincy, and there is no ground for the supposition, that he was singular in this respect. The board, as a body, is indirectly represented by Mr. Noyes, soon after, as consisting of " Latitudinarians," like those who had the direction of the college at Cambridge. If suspicion of a man's orthodoxy is sufficient to prove him of a " catholic spirit," the President and Fellows of Yale College have strong support of this kind ; since from the time Mr. Noyes wrote his letter to Judge Sewall in 1723, and perhaps from a much earlier period, there has never been a day, when that body have not lain under the imputa-

* Vol. II. p. 7.

tion from some quarter or other, of having, more or less, "departed from the faith."

But can it be true, that the first trustees of Yale College were "liberal" and "catholic," in the sense in which these epithets are used by President Quincy? If we correctly apprehend his meaning, he would be understood to say, that the founders of Harvard College designedly gave it a constitution which, so far as any provision of the charter was concerned, would admit of its easily passing into the hands of any sect of religionists, who could use the words "piety" and "godliness;" and that in making their fundamental arrangements, they had this object distinctly in view. This we do not believe to have been the fact in Connecticut; and yet every argument adduced to prove it to have been true at Harvard is equally cogent to prove it to have been true at Yale. The first trustees of the latter college had the proposition distinctly before them, to insert a provision in their charter, that strict Calvinism should be taught; and on consideration, they rejected it. Not that they were not Calvinists, or did not intend to make their own system of faith the ground of religious instruction. They undoubtedly supposed, that they were abundantly secured in another way. "They were as orthodox Calvinists as any men," but, like President Holyoke, were not disposed to adopt "new measures."

The question here, we wish it understood, is not how far the present directors of either Harvard or Yale, in the management of their respective institutions, are bound to respect the religious opinions of their founders; or whether they are bound at all. These questions are of entirely a different character from that which we are about to consider, and would lead to a discussion, on which we have no inclination at present to enter. The inquiry will be simply as to the matter of fact, whether the founders of Harvard College were "liberal" in the sense above explained? In our opinion, the reasoning of President Quincy on this point is inconclusive and unsatisfactory.

[*To be continued.*]

ARTICLE IX.

ANGLO-SAXON LITERATURE.

THE Saxon part of the English language has, as yet, attracted but little attention in the United States. The causes of this neglect are obvious. The importance of studying the language, as a whole, or any part of it, has not been deeply felt. Our institutions of learning have been tardy in making provision for the radical study of the vernacular speech. Professors of the English language have not, in general, formed a part of the corps of instruction in a college. If the subject has received any degree of attention, it has been indirect and ineffectual. The history of the language, its structure, its various dialects have been considered as falling into the province of the antiquarian, rather than as being a matter of intense interest, and of great practical value to the general student. In our seminaries, the subject has been conjoined with, or appended to the department of oratory or belles-lettres, as if unworthy to stand on independent ground.

Again, the influence of certain writers has been unfavorable to the development of the original elements of the language. They have bowed down before Latin or French idols. In their zeal for high-sounding periods, or the polysyllabic march of a sentence, they have overlooked that which imparts to the language its masculine energy, its iron strength, its wedge-like force. Writers, like Dr. Johnson and Gibbon, have exerted a pernicious influence.* Their peculiarities are precisely such as attract the admiration of the young, at the period when the style is in a process of formation. It is singular that a man of so much acumen as the great lexicographer, who, in his conversation, showed such powers of irony and sarcasm, who, in other words, possessed qualities of mind which naturally seek

* The recent editor of Gibbon, Mr. Milman, has some of the faults of his author. In the *History of Christianity*, his style is exceedingly faulty. Not a few sentences are wretchedly ungrammatical. The history is, in many respects, very interesting.

short and pithy modes of expression, should have employed, in his written compositions, such a rotund and ponderous Latin terminology. The influence of Burke's writings has been, in a degree, like that of Dr. Johnson's. Robert Hall's style, though it combines distinguished excellencies, is still wanting in the force and simplicity which is the result of familiarity with the Saxon elements. His conversation and his ordinary style of preaching were not chargeable with this fault, at least in an equal degree.

We shall, perhaps, be pardoned in referring to two individuals in our own country, who have illustrated what may be called the Roman and the Saxon styles of composition. Dr. Dwight, in his more elaborate discourses, like the one which was preached before the American Board for Foreign Missions, has the pomp and stateliness of a well trained Castilian. Polysyllables roll along in imperial magnificence. On the other hand, Dr. Beecher has the sententious brevity, the point, the fiery glow of one who has smelted the ore in the native mines; who determines, with a sort of blacksmith energy, to force an instant entrance into the citadel of the conscience. Hence he uses hot shot and hand-grenades, rather than the thundering cannon.

We do not intend, by these remarks, to decry the use of Latin and French words. It is the honor of the English language, that it is a mixed one, that it has gathered the spoils of many realms and tongues. It is a poor conceit, which would confine a writer to words of one or two letters. There are thoughts and feelings which refuse to be compressed into monosyllables. There are species of compositions which demand, for their full effect, that they should be clothed in the Roman toga. The English translation of the Bible is celebrated for its thorough Saxon character. Yet, when occasion calls, the venerable translators resort to their Gallic and Italian neighbors. What can be more perfectly Latin than the version of some of the sublimer passages in the Apocalypse?

Another cause of the neglect of the Anglo-Saxon may be traced to the common impression that we are sufficiently acquainted with it already. We may not be able to read the letters; we may possess no Saxon dictionary; we may not have looked into any author anterior to Chaucer, or, perhaps, to Shakspeare; we may have never analyzed the language into its original elements, and yet we may deceive ourselves

with the impression that we understand the Anglo-Saxon, because we can write tolerably good English. But a perfect mastery of the latter depends on a careful study of the former. An acquaintance with the dialect of Alfred and of Alfric would enlarge our vocabulary, would amplify the knowledge which we already have; would give significance to terms which we now lazily utter, with but a dim apprehension that they mean any thing; and, in short, would show us how rich our mother dialect is. We need to enliven and enlarge our most current and familiar ideas, lest they should become stagnant and nothing worth.

We may mention, as an additional reason for the want of interest in Saxon studies, the difficulty which has existed, until very recently, of procuring the suitable apparatus of grammars, lexicons, etc. The works of Hickes, Lye, and some others have, indeed, long been found in some of our large libraries. But where these volumes are accessible, scarcely any thing could be more unattractive. They contain treasures of knowledge, but to the beginner exceedingly uncouth and repulsive.

Within a few years, however, this want has been supplied. A new zest for the study of the Anglo-Saxon has been awakened in England. Several individuals, most of them now living, have given us good fruits, as the result of their industrious and well-directed labors. A number of distinguished scholars on the continent have earnestly and successfully co-operated. In the following pages we propose to give a brief account of these labors, or, of the present condition of Anglo-Saxon studies in England. A slight retrospect of its past history may not be unacceptable.*

* A brief article on this subject was inserted in Vol X. of the *Bibl. Repos.*, first series, pp. 386—398. We shall endeavor not to repeat the statements made in that article. Since that was published, however, great advances have been made in England in Anglo-Saxon studies, and several valuable books have been issued. Among these are Dr. Bosworth's *Dictionary*, in 930 pages large octavo, and Petheram's *Anglo-Saxon Literature in England*. We have drawn freely from these volumes, especially from the last named. We have also before us *Palgrave's History of the Anglo-Saxons*; and several Anglo-Saxon grammars, *Rev. Henry Soames's History of the Anglo-Saxon Church*, the *Deutsche Grammatik* of Grimm of Göttingen, and the various reviews and notices which have recently

Whether the Saxons, on their invasion of Britain, possessed a knowledge of written language, has been much disputed. Like most of the Teutonic race, they employed *Runes* to record their events. After the conversion of the Britons to Christianity, the Roman Missionaries taught them to write in the manner to which they had been accustomed. Hence the origin of what we now term the Anglo-Saxon letters; but there are three only which strictly possess that character, and they are derived apparently from the ancient Runes. These are equivalent to our *th*, *dh* and *w*. What we term the Saxon alphabet was that which was in general use in England from the 13th to the 16th century. The first school established in England was at Canterbury, at the beginning of the 7th century. Ethelbert, king of Kent, who assisted Augustine in promoting the conversion of the people, was the author of the first written Anglo-Saxon laws, which have descended to us, or which are known to have been established. Theodore, ordained Archbishop of Canterbury near the close of the 7th century, in conjunction with his friend Adrian, brought over many books from Rome, and zealously diffused knowledge wherever he went. Egbert, who was Archbishop of York in 712, founded a noble library at York. The celebrated and truly venerable Bede, to whom all who speak the English language are so much indebted, began his education at seven years of age, in the monastery of Weremouth. His writings embrace almost every subject of learning then known. By their diffusion a flood of light was poured in on the minds of his countrymen.* Learning was not now confined to ecclesiastics and kings. The Anglo-Saxon women were not only learners but teachers. In the Epistles of Boniface, we find many letters addressed to him by his female pupils, which show their acquisitions in Latin verse as well as prose. About the year 728, Ina, king of the West Saxons, founded a school for the instruction of his countrymen, who chose to be educated at Rome.

In 849, Alfred the Great was born. He conceived the noble

appeared in England on the subject. Our main design in this paper is to communicate information which may be valuable to the American student, and which is not easily accessible.

* His Ecclesiastical History has just been issued from the press, accompanied by a good English translation, in a very handsome volume.

design of founding a vernacular literature, and by his personal exertions he realized very considerably that wise and generous intention. He rendered, from Latin into Anglo-Saxon, Bede's Ecclesiastical History, the Geography of Orosius, Boethius on the Consolation of Philosophy, Pope Gregory's Pastoral, and a selection from the Confessions of Augustine. There is reason also to believe that he made translations from the Fables of Æsop, compiled a book of Proverbs and wrote a treatise on falconry. His versions of Scripture did not, probably, extend beyond such portions as appeared, from time to time, peculiarly suited to his own comfort and instruction. He seems, however, to have been employed on a regular translation of the Psalms when overtaken by a summons to eternity. He died in his 52d year, in A. D. 901.

After Alfred, we may consider Alfric, the abbot, but better known as the grammarian, as the principal creator of Saxon literature. Among his works are treatises on the Trinity and on the Old and New Testaments, a Latin Grammar, a Latin-Saxon Glossary, a translation of the Latin Grammar into Anglo-Saxon, a portion of the Saxon Chronicle, etc.

The language, up to the time of the Conquest, was Anglo-Saxon. From that period to the middle of the 13th century, it has acquired, with doubtful propriety, the name of Semi-Saxon; and from that period to the Reformation, the name of Middle-English. The Norman language was by no means unknown before the times of the Conqueror. Many of the youth of England, in the reign of Edward the Confessor, were sent to the schools of France; and a continued intercourse between the two countries was carried on long before this period. Now, however, Norman-French became the language of the court, and various causes conspired gradually to change the ancient forms of speech. This was especially true in the large commercial towns, and in the great thoroughfares of business. In the agricultural population of the remoter counties, the relics of ancient times are still visible. Thus it is, that the same names of agricultural implements, their uses, the occupations of agriculture, the names and boundaries of fields, the streams which divide one possession from another, and the names of villages, hamlets and towns remain as they were before the Conquest. In the west of England, a language is still spoken in many places which bears no strict, definite relation to any written composition that we find in books. Many of the words are

now obsolete in written compositions. On referring to the Anglo-Saxon writings, we find them. They are seen in the Semi-Saxon pages of Layamon, and in those of Robert of Gloucester. There are many reasons for believing that the Saxon language was never extinct in England. Camden tells us that in the Abbey of Tavistock, which had a Saxon founder about 961, "there were solemn lectures in the Saxon tongue, even to the time of our fathers, that the knowledge of the language might not fail as it has since well nigh done." William L'Isle, in his preface to the *Saxon Monuments*, published by him in 1623, thus alludes to the subject: "Thanks be to God, that he that conquered the land, could not so conquer the language, but that, in memory of our fathers, it hath been preserved with common lectures," etc.

Before the year 1525, we find a printing press already erected in the monastery of Tavistock. John Leland, the antiquary of Henry VIII., appears to have been the first individual of the reformed faith who possessed a knowledge of the Saxon language, and collected Saxon MSS. Archbishop Parker, three years after the publication of his book on "priests' marriages," and when the great Bible, which came out in 1572, was in preparation, distributed parts of the Old Testament to different bishops for the purpose of translation, and sent at the same time to all of them, severally, a request, that while making a visitation in their dioceses, they would examine the books in their churches and inform him what they were, and whether there were among them any Saxon authors. The Archbishop also sent out a circular letter, for the same purpose, under the Queen's authority. John Batman incidentally states, that in the space of four years, he procured 6,700 books for Parker. Persons were kept in his family who could imitate any of the old characters to be found in MSS. John Joscelin, his secretary and amanuensis, collected, it is supposed, the materials for Parker's *Antiquitates at Britannicæ*, published in 1572. Joscelin edited and published the first entire work in the Anglo-Saxon, which ever came from the press. This was a "Testimony of Antiquitie respecting the body and blood of the Lord." Among his works (he was assisted by John, son of the Archbishop) was a Saxon-Latin Dictionary. He also prepared a grammar which has been lost. The third publication in Anglo-Saxon literature, which issued from the press of John Day, was the *Gospels*, by Fox the Martyrologist.

At the opening of the 17th century, we find almost a blank in

regard to the Saxon language. One individual, William Camden, appears as a promoter of the Saxon tongue. In his "*Britannia*" we have many details of Saxon history; and in the "*Remaines concerning Britaine*," first published in 1605, we have some chapters which treat of the Saxon tongue, and of the derivation of our names and surnames, as well as names of places, from it. "The ground of our own tongue," he remarks, "appertaineth to the old Saxon. The Italian is pleasant but without sinews, as a still fleeting water. The French delicate, but even nice as a woman, scarce daring to open her lips for fear of marring her countenance. The Spanish majestic, but fulsome, running too much on the O, and terrible like the divell in a play. The Dutch manlike, but withal very harsh, as one ready at every word to pick a quarrel. Now we, in borrowing from them, give the strength of consonants to the Italian, the full sound of words to the French, the varieties of termination to the Spanish, and the mollifying of more vowels to the Dutch, and so, like bees, gather the honey of their good qualities, and leave the dregs to themselves. How then can the language, which consisteth of all these, sound other than most full of sweetness?"

In 1623, William L'Isle published "a Saxon treatise on the Old and New Testament, written about the time of King Edgar, 700 years ago, by Alfricus Abbas," etc. Various Saxon treatises were appended. He also prepared for publication various portions of Alfric's Saxon translation from the Old Testament, accompanied by an English version. His labors seem to have awakened a new interest in Saxon studies. Sir Henry Spelman settled a Saxon lecture in the university of Cambridge, allowing £20 per annum to Mr. Abraham Whelock, the first incumbent. Spelman published a Glossary of the Saxon tongue, at his own cost. By various other labors, he is entitled to a high rank among the promoters of Anglo-Saxon literature in England. In 1640, Sir John Spelman published the Anglo-Saxon version of the Psalter, with an interlinear Latin translation, and dedicated it to Laud, whom he praises as a preserver of ancient MSS. and a patron of the Saxon tongue. Usher was another promoter of this study. In 1655, Francis Junius, professor at Heidelberg, but for a long time resident in England, where he died, published Caedmon's Metrical Paraphrase, and the Gothic and Anglo-Saxon Gospels. He had apparently intended, as early as 1654, to publish an Anglo-Saxon

Glossary. Many of his works are in MS. in the Bodleian library. His *Etymologicon Anglicanum* was published by Lye, in two volumes folio, 1750. His great work, the Glossary of five Northern languages, Dr. Fell caused to be transcribed for the press in nine folio volumes, but which has never been published. The number and variety of his works display the unwearied industry of his character.

On the death of Whelock, in 1657, he was succeeded by William Somner, who brought out, in 1659, the first Anglo-Saxon Dictionary ever printed. It is a Saxon-Latin-English Dictionary. Many of the notes are also in English. At the end are the Latin-Saxon Grammar and Glossary of Alfric. In 1660, he published the "History of Gavelkind," to which is added an appendix of charters and other instruments in Saxon, some of which are accompanied with Latin, and others with interlinear English translations. Many of his books and papers were accidentally burned. From the publication of his Dictionary, a new path was opened to the English philologist. The English language, also, began to receive the attention of continental and of English scholars. In 1689, the Anglo-Saxon Grammar of Dr. George Hickes, the first ever compiled, was published. In 1692, Gibson edited an improved text of the Saxon Chronicle. The types which Junius had presented to Oxford were employed in 1698 to print Alfred's Anglo-Saxon version of *De Consolatione Philosophiæ*. As early as 1698, Edward Thwaites became a preceptor in Saxon at Queen's College, Oxford. On the 24th of March of that year, he observes, "we want Saxon Lexicons. I have fifteen young students in that language, and but one Somner for them all." He was subsequently engaged by Hickes to superintend the "*Thesaurus Linguarum veterum Septentrionalium*" through the press. Other important works were published by Thwaites. He died at the age of 44, leaving a high character for learning and talents. Hickes's *Thesaurus* came out in 1705, in three folio volumes. Of this work, Mr. J. M. Kemble says: "Though modern attention has detected so many errors as to render Hickes's Grammars rather dangerous than useful, we owe him great and hearty thanks for his labors. The enthusiasm which he brought with him to his task spread far beyond himself; a host of Saxon students rose around him; and his Grammar answered all the wants of which they were conscious." Humphrey Wanley, born in March 1671-2, and bred a limner, drew up the catalogue of Anglo-Saxon MSS.,

which forms a part of Hickes's Thesaurus. Many of Wanley's MS. works are in the British Museum. William Elstob and his sister Elizabeth, relatives of Dr. Hickes, were very zealous promoters of Anglo-Saxon literature. Elizabeth published an Anglo-Saxon Homily and a Grammar; she also assisted her brother in various undertakings. She, likewise, made a collection of above eighty Sermons and Tracts, of which nine sheets only were printed. From the cynical account of a contemporary, we learn that "she was of an ancient family and genteel fortune; but pursuing too much the drug called learning, and in that respect failed of being careful of the one thing necessary."

An edition of the Anglo-Saxon Laws by Dr. Wilkins appeared in 1721. Some of the English prelates, particularly Gibson bishop of London, and Nicolson bishop of Gloucester, afforded a constant and generous patronage to Anglo-Saxon scholars. The latter wrote a dissertation on the Feudal Law of the Saxons. In 1722, appeared a valuable edition of Bede's Ecclesiastical History at Cambridge, with the Latin text, Alfred's Saxon translation, followed by a few charters, etc. A new impulse was given to the Saxon learning in 1750 by the establishment of a lecture in the university of Oxford, by Dr. Richard Rawlinson. Edward Lye superintended the publication of Junius's Etymologicon Anglicanum, prefixing to it an Anglo-Saxon Grammar of his own. In 1750, he printed an edition of the Gothic Gospels, and prefixed to it a Gothic Grammar. He died in 1767, after he had printed about 30 sheets of his Anglo-Saxon and Gothic Dictionary. His friend, the Rev. Owen Manning, published it in 1772, in 2 vols. folio, adding a valuable preface and appendix. "We owe a thousand thanks," says the Rev. Mr. Halbertsma of Holland, "to Lye, who gives us the Anglo-Saxon words as he found them, and never alters the orthography *to suit* his own views."*

In 1795, a Saxon professor, the Rev. James Ingram, was chosen in the university of Oxford, Rawlinson's design not having been before carried into execution. With the 19th century, began a new era in Saxon literature. The publication of the first edition of Sharon Turner's History of the Anglo-Saxons in successive volumes, between the years 1799 and 1805, appears to have excited attention, not only towards their history, but by the addition to it of an account of their language and liter-

* Preface to Bosworth's Dictionary, p. 38.

ature, a slow but gradually increasing attention has been awakened. "The Anglo-Saxon MSS.," says Mr. Turner, "lay still unexamined, and neither their contents, nor the important facts, which the ancient writers and records of other nations had preserved of the transactions and fortunes of our ancestors, had ever been made a part of our general history. The *Quida*, or Death Song of Lodbrog, first led the present author to perceive the deficiency, and excited his wish to supply it. A series of careful researches into every original document, that he had the opportunity of examining, was immediately begun and steadily pursued, till all that was most worth preserving was collected from the Anglo-Saxon MSS. and other ancient books. The valuable information thus obtained, the author endeavored to give the public in a readable form in this work, of which two thirds have not before appeared in English." Successive editions, in 1807, 1818, 1823, 1828 and 1838, show the estimation in which this great history has been held by the public in England and the United States. In 1807, Prof. Ingram published an inaugural lecture on the utility of Anglo-Saxon Literature, to which he added Alfred's Geography of Europe. In 1819, Miss Gurney of Keswick, Norfolk, edited the first English version of the Saxon Chronicle. In 1823, it was published, with large additions, by Mr. Ingram. In the same year, appeared the Rev. J. Bosworth's *Elements of Anglo-Saxon Grammar*, in 332 pages octavo. It was a very seasonable and valuable production, though encumbered with many matters which do not strictly belong to a grammar. An *Epitome* of it was published in 1826. A new edition of Warton's *History of English Poetry*, much enlarged by Mr. Richard Price, came out in 4 vols. 8vo, in 1824. The editor, in a preface of 120 pages, as well as in the notes, has ably discussed several interesting points connected with Anglo-Saxon poetry and romances. The *Illustration of Anglo-Saxon Poetry*, by J. J. Coneybeare, edited, together with additional notes, by his brother, W. D. Coneybeare, 1826, is a work of very considerable merit. In 1828, Mr. Cardale of Leicester, published the *Will of King Alfred*, with notes; and in 1829, an edition of Alfred's *Boethius*, with an English translation, which, being as literal as possible, preserves the idiom of the original. In 1830, the Rev. Henry Soames published an "Inquiry into the Doctrines of the Anglo-Saxon Church, in eight sermons preached before the University of Cambridge," at the Bampton

lecture. In 1832, Mr. Benjamin Thorpe published Caedmon's Metrical Paraphrase, under the auspices of a Committee of the Society of Antiquarians in London. It is said that that poem bears a considerable similarity to the *Paradise Lost* of Milton. The translation is exceedingly spirited. Fifty-three engravings accompany the work. In 1831-2, appeared the great work of Sir. Francis Palgrave, in 2 vols. quarto, entitled: "The Rise and Progress of the English Commonwealth, Anglo-Saxon Period, containing the Anglo-Saxon Polity, and the institutions arising out of laws and usages which prevailed before the Conquest." To those who take a deep interest in the origin and progress of the English language and the English constitution, it is a mine of wealth. No office, however minute, no station however high, has been passed over without its several bearings having been pointed out, and its importance carefully marked.* A volume which should always accompany it is "Allen's Inquiry into the Rise and Growth of the Royal Prerogative in England," which contains sounder views on this subject than are to be met with in any volume of its size published within the last century. About this time, the Grammars of Hunter and Gwilt appeared, which are not considered of great value. In 1833, John M. Kemble, Esq. of Trinity College, Cambridge, published the poem of Beowulf, the most remarkable composition which exists in the Anglo-Saxon tongue. The publication of this venerable poem excited great interest, and the limited number of copies which were printed, were sold in three months.

In 1834, Mr. Thorpe published a work of the highest value to all students of the Anglo-Saxon—"Analecta Anglo-Saxonica; a selection in prose and verse from Anglo-Saxon authors of various ages, with a Glossary." One chapter of the gospels is given in the Saxon character, that the student may have no difficulty when he meets with any work in that character, either printed or in MS. With this exception, and the use of the characters for *th* and *dh*, the entire text of the *Analecta* is in Roman letter. In 1834, Mr. Thorpe published "The Anglo-Saxon Translation of the Romance of Apollonius of Tyre." "The Anglo-Saxon Church, its history, revenues and general character, by the Rev. Henry Soames, M. A., London, 1835," is

* Petheram's *Anglo-Saxon Literature*, p. 146.

another valuable addition to our previous knowledge of the early English church.

The work so long and so anxiously expected by the Saxon students of England—an Anglo-Saxon and English Dictionary—was at length published in the year 1838, in a thick octavo volume, with the following title: “A Dictionary of the Anglo-Saxon Language, containing the accentuation, the grammatical inflections, the irregular words referred to, their themes, the parallel terms from the other Gothic languages, the meaning of the Anglo-Saxon in English and Latin, and copious English and Latin Indexes, serving as a Dictionary of English and Anglo-Saxon, as well as of Latin and Anglo-Saxon; with a Preface on the Origin and Connection of the Germanic tongues, a map of languages, and the essentials of Anglo-Saxon Grammar; by the Rev. J. Bosworth, LL. D., English Chaplain at Rotterdam; London, 1838.” The matter in the introduction is of the most interesting kind. With the view of illustrating the Anglo-Saxon, nearly all the radical words, and a few important compounds are followed by the parallel terms, from the cognate dialects. For this portion of the work, the author was indebted to a zealous and learned friend, a native of Holstein, who used his utmost efforts to verify every word introduced among the parallels, and to give the orthography correctly. In order to show more clearly the analogy of the cognate languages, they have been arranged in the order of their affinity, which was considered most natural. The explanation of the Anglo-Saxon is in English, one word of which is often identical with the Saxon, by which the necessity of a long paraphrastic Latin rendering is superseded, and the definition shortened. To ensure the authority of Somner and Lye, and the sanction of Saxon scholars, the Latin significations are added. By a proper attention to the economy of space in printing, without interfering with typographical neatness, more practical information is comprised in this octavo volume than in the two ponderous folios of Lye and Manning.*

* We are glad to learn that a considerable number of copies of Dr. Bosworth's Dictionary have been sold in the United States. For the sake of the excellent author, as well as for other reasons, we wish that this number were many fold what it is. The first edition is now sold. We hope the author may, in a second, reap from the public at large, that solid remuneration.

Among the Saxon works which appeared in England in 1839 and 1840, were a History of English Rhythms, by Edwin Guest; Music and the Anglo-Saxons, by F. D. Wackerbarth; Principia Saxonica, or an Introduction to Anglo-Saxon Reading, by L. Langley; Reliquiæ Antiquæ, a work published in numbers, and designed to collect together such pieces from ancient inedited MSS., illustrative of the literature and language of the Middle Ages, as are not of sufficient extent to form books by themselves; and, lastly, the work of Mr. Petheram, to which we are indebted for many of the facts in this brief sketch, and which we cordially recommend to our readers for its research, impartiality, copiousness and accuracy.

The formation of the Camden and British Historical Societies may be looked upon as animating signs of the times. The Royal Society of Literature has determined on the publication of a Biographia Britannica Literaria, in chronological order. An introduction to the first section has appeared, under the title of "An Essay on the State of Literature and Learning under the Anglo-Saxons, by Thomas Wright." The Historical Society have recently issued a volume of Charters relating to the Anglo-Saxon period, edited by Mr. Kemble, who has prefixed an introduction of great interest and value, in which he has discussed the question respecting the authenticity of the Anglo-Saxon charters. An edition of the Anglo-Saxon Laws, under the care of Mr. Thorpe, will soon be published. An elaborate work by Mr. Petrie, entitled, "Materials for the History of Great Britain," is in a course of preparation.

On the continent a gradually increasing attention has been given to Anglo-Saxon literature. The first edition of Grimm's "Deutsche Grammatik" was published in a single volume, in 1812. The first volume of a second edition was published in 1822, at Göttingen; the second volume followed in 1826, the third, in 1831, and the last in 1837.* "The system of this

ation which his laborious, learned and accurate work so amply deserves. The spirit which reigns throughout is eminently such as becomes a scholar and a Christian.

* We have several volumes of this edition. It is printed, particularly the first volume, on most wretched paper, hardly fit for spelling-books or wrapping-paper. It is a shame that such a noble work should not come out in an attractive form. Other important works on the general subject of the German

scholar," says Mr. Kemble, "which can henceforth alone form the basis of any philosophical study of the Teutonic tongues, rests upon two propositions. 1. That the roots of these languages, their methods of declension, conjugation and derivation are common to them all. Time may have rendered some of them obsolete; but still there they are, under some form or other, in some one or other of their derivatives. 2. That each language, according to fixed laws of its own, differences the common element. The knowledge of the roots themselves, their modifications and gradual restrictions of meaning, must be sought in all the languages combined. The nature of each tongue determines the particular form that each root shall have in that tongue; hence we may sometimes, when at a loss for the meaning of a word, gain light upon the subject, by transferring the form in Anglo-Saxon to its equivalent in Gothic, Old Norse, or Old High Dutch. The only evil attendant on this work is its vast extent; but however it may terrify the idle, or baffle the dull, it is the most magnificent present ever made to Teutonic scholars; and as I have good reason to know, the Anglo-Saxon Grammar is beyond comparison the most philosophical and complete that has ever yet appeared in Europe." In 1815, Prof. Thorlekin of Copenhagen printed the poem of Beowulf with a Latin translation. In 1817, an Anglo-Saxon Grammar was printed at Stockholm by Prof. Rask of Copenhagen. The second edition, enlarged and improved by the author, was translated from the Danish by Benjamin Thorpe, and published at Copenhagen in 1830. The grammar is preceded by a preface of 60 pages, which is chiefly occupied by a comparison of the Anglo-Saxon with the Icelandic. The last part contains a clear account of Anglo-Saxon versification, and a selection of reading lessons.* In 1820, Dr. Grundtvig published at Copen-

and its cognate languages, are Bopp's *Vocalismus oder Sprachvergleichende Kritiken über J. Grimm's Deutsche Grammatik*, etc.; Schmitthenner's *kurzes Deutsches Wörterbuch*, 1834; and Dr. Becker's *Die Deutsche Wortbildung*, 1826. See Bosworth's Dictionary, Preface p. 167.

* "Mr. Turner's and Sir F. Palgrave's important works must be carefully read by every Anglo-Saxon student. These for history, and Rask and Grimm for philosophy are rich sources of information for those who are interested in the Anglo-Saxon language and literature." *Bosworth*. To these we ought now to add Dr. Bosworth's Dictionary.

hagen a Danish paraphrase of Beowulf. A valuable commentary on the Anglo-Saxon Laws was published by Phillips at Göttingen in 1826. The Laws of Canute appeared at Copenhagen the same year, in Latin, with various readings and the Anglo-Saxon text; and in 1830, came out Dr. Mone's Materials and Researches for a History of the German Literature and Language, in which will be found several Anglo-Saxon interlinear glosses. Dr. J. A. Schmeller of Munich published in the same year, "The Heliand, or History of our Saviour's Life." In 1836, a series of works on Anglo-Saxon literature by MM. de Larenaudière and Michel was commenced in Paris. The second volume of the collection came out in 1837 entitled: "Bibliothèque Anglo-Saxonne, par Francisque Michel." Though not without value, it would seem to be a work of more pretension than its merits justify. Prefixed to the work is a letter by Mr. J. M. Kemble, in English, which extends to upwards of 60 pages, giving a brief sketch of Anglo-Saxon literature in England and on the Continent.

We have now completed the brief sketch which we designed. The subject is one of great interest to all who speak the English language. A writer, in a late number of the *Edinburgh Review*, has endeavored to analyze the nature of those words for which the modern language is indebted to the more ancient. The words in the English language he estimates at 38,000, and of those derived from the Saxon, as five-eighths, or about 23,000; but those derived from the latter are of that character that their recurrence, from their very nature, oftener takes place than others, and hence the language partakes, in a still greater degree, of the older forms. English grammar is almost exclusively occupied with what is of Anglo-Saxon origin; the names of the greater part of objects of sense; those words which are expressive of our earliest and dearest connections, and the strongest principles of our nature, are mostly of Anglo-Saxon origin.* It is asserted, also, that some of our best modern writers have been returning to a similar model, and, by necessity, the disuse of many words from the Greek and Latin, has introduced those of Saxon origin. Nearly all our national proverbs, those homely lessons of wisdom, in which so much thrift and carefulness shine out, are derived from the same tongue. To the Anglo-Saxon Wills, we must look for information

* See Petheram, p. 175, and *Edinburgh Review*, Oct. 1839.

respecting the law of real property, the descent and liabilities of lands, the nature of tenure and service, the power of the popular councils, a reasonable account of household arrangements, and disposition of real and personal estate.

In the actual and prospective spread of the English tongue, we find a new motive to study it fundamentally. The language of the venerable Bede is spoken at the sources of the Mississippi and the Indus. The institutions of Alfred are the defence and glory of states and empires, compared with which the kingdoms of Essex, Kent and East-Anglia were but insignificant villages. Anglo-American energy is peopling a continent with those who revere and love the great names that live in British story. English armies and navies are carrying the Ante-Norman dialect into the vale of Cashmire, over the wall of China, into the cannibal islands of the southern ocean. The descendants of a few wild but stout-hearted Angles, who left the woods of Germany 1400 years ago, are now thundering in the track of the crusaders, dictating the terms of their future intercourse with an empire of 400,000,000, casting into the shade the victories of Alexander, even on the identical ground which he traversed ; in the same year tracing the long sought passage between North America and Asia, and discovering at the opposite pole a new continent. What is better still, the children of those whose light shone so brightly in the writings of Bede, Alfred and Alfric are now carrying the light of life back to the regions where it was first enkindled, and to other realms which Scandinavian enterprise had not then reached. Happy are we who enjoy the language, the liberties and the religion for which so many generations have toiled and bled ; happier still, if we prove worthy descendants of such sires, good stewards of God's manifold gifts.

ARTICLE X.

REVIEW OF COLEMAN'S ANTIQUITIES OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

By Ralph Emerson, D. D., Prof. of Eccl. Hist., Theol. Sem., Andover, Mass.

The Antiquities of the Christian Church. Translated and Compiled from the Works of Augusti, with numerous Additions from Rheinwald, Siegel and others. By Rev. Lyman Coleman. Andover & New-York: Gould, Newman & Saxton. Boston: Tappan & Dennett; Gould, Kendall & Lincoln. Philadelphia: Henry Perkins. 1841. pp. 557.

AMONG the bright features in the present aspect of the Protestant world, we may safely reckon the increasing attention that is paid to the early history of the Christian Church. For were it only the indulgence of curiosity, it would be one of the most rational and harmless indulgences of that knowledge-seeking faculty, which can be imagined;—far safer than the direction into which the serpent beguiled the same noble but perilous endowment of our first parents;—and far safer, we may add, than any of those directions into which he now beguiles unstable souls. To ponder veritable history of any kind is much better than to listen to the most enchanting fictions. And to the child of God, what can be more congenial than to study the record of the early struggles, perils and triumphs of that cause to which his heart is now devoted for eternity, and on which the heart of his Saviour was fixed from eternity;—to muse, too, on the infant efforts of the Church towards the systematic development of Christian doctrine, and then, on its childlike application of the doctrine itself, whether wisely or not, in the early formation of Christian life and Christian institutions? No employment, we say, of human curiosity is more harmless or more rational; and none, we may further say, is of better omen or brighter promise. It argues well for the single mind that spontaneously takes such a direction, and very well for that community which is brought, in any way, to receive such a direction.

It is not, however, nor can it be, the mere indulgence of curiosity. Good will come of it, and much every way. For,

next to the study of the Bible itself, what can promise more for the correct understanding of the truth it contains, than an accurate knowledge of the ways in which those truths have been understood, in diverse ages and by diverse kinds of men? And what can conduce more to a correct application of those truths to practice, than a knowledge of the different ways in which they have actually been applied? The experience of ages is surely one of the chief correctives for all kinds of mistakes; and next to inspiration itself, the grand voucher for whatever is true in theory or wise in practice.

In proof of the fact that an increasing attention has lately been paid to the early history of the Church, we need only allude to the rapidly increasing number of works on this subject, which are annually issued from the press in this and other Protestant countries. The supply is a good index of the demand, while it also serves to increase that demand.

If inquired of for the reason of this increase, our answer is at hand, and is manifold. Literature of almost every kind is rapidly advancing. During the last age, science, in distinction from literature, engrossed far the greater share of studious toil, in this country and in Europe, with the exception perhaps of Germany; and the mournful cry was not raised in vain, that learning was perishing from the earth. And, as is common in such cases, the cry has been continued, with but little abatement, to the present hour, though the occasion of alarm has ceased, and the prospect now is, that literature will soon stand in her full strength by the side of her sister science.

Peace, blessed peace, the daughter and handmaid of true religion, now so long enjoyed between the most enlightened nations, may be regarded as the chief cause of this relative change. War, while it is an unnatural stimulant to many of the arts and sciences, and indirectly encourages nearly all the rest, is wont to thrust its maniac sword into the very vitals of literature. Amid the roar of cannon, the march of armies, and the sight of blood, the mind of whole nations becomes ferocious, and ceases to care, and then ceases to know about the pursuits of peaceful learning. It can think, and write and read of battles, and of the means of gaining battles, but of nothing else.

France, once so distinguished for both sacred and profane learning, is a living proof of what the spirit of war can do in this part of its devastating sphere. "France has no literature," is the sigh of a recent French writer. And peculiarly is this

true in regard to religious literature ; yet France is pre-eminent in science. The martial soul of Napoleon seemed to extend itself into every French bosom ; or rather, every Frenchman's soul seemed but a Gnostic emanation from the ruthless *Æon* of the Révolution. From this effect of the war spirit, France has scarcely begun to recover. England, too, has deeply felt the like effects in her literary pursuits. And Germany was saved from them,—so far as she was saved at all,—partly by her division into small kingdoms, which could hope for no martial glory ; but chiefly by what is otherwise her deepest calamity, the despotic sway of her sovereigns, allowing no scope for the common mind to become absorbed in political concerns. Hence it is, in no small degree, that Germany kept on in her literary career ; and, when emerging from the wars of the last age, was found so far in advance of the rest of the world. And now, in these peaceful days, time and ample opportunities are afforded for disseminating through other nations the accumulated and accumulating fruits of German acquisition.

Two causes, however, in addition to a difference of languages, have conspired to retard in a measure the dissemination of these fruits. The diverse and seemingly artificial mould in which the German mind casts its productions, together with some lack of common sense in discriminating between important and unimportant matters, may be regarded as one of these causes ; and it is one which calls for the sound discretion and independent thought of the compiler from their works, if he would present the results of their labors in the most intelligible and attractive form. The other cause, to which we allude, is the deep, and, for a time, indiscriminate suspicion of heresy that rested on the theological productions of Germany. So many of them were found infected with error, that such a suspicion naturally became too strong for any thing but time and the means of more accurate discrimination to allay. But now the language is more extensively cultivated among us, and the vast difference between different German authors is better known. God, too, has of late years raised up many pious and able men among them, whose character for general soundness in the faith is universally acknowledged, and who have corrected the errors of their skeptical countrymen, and turned their treasures of knowledge to the best account. The consequence is, that while the Christian community, both here and in England, have become better fortified against German error, the indiscriminate suspi-

cion has subsided, and a taste for German learning, or rather for thoroughgoing research itself, has vastly increased.

This propitious change is particularly manifest in the departments of Biblical Criticism and Ecclesiastical History. Intimately connected as these two departments are, it could hardly be expected that either should rise or sink alone. Both rose together at the time of the Reformation, under the auspices of Luther, Melancthon, Calvin, Beza and the Magdeburg Centuriators; and both sunk together at a subsequent period. And both are now rising again in company,—biblical criticism having naturally enough taken the lead in this country. Much might be said to our present purpose, on the increased and rapidly increasing means for the pursuit of such literature, from the multiplication and endowment of seminaries, and the increase of books, and the higher demands for learning in the ministry. But both the facts and their influence are too obvious to require illustration.

A further and most powerful cause of the increased attention to the history, especially to the antiquities of the Church, as well as to biblical criticism, is found in the controversies between rival sects, and in the grand contest which the Church as a body has to sustain against her skeptical foes.

When the remarkable era of Bible Societies arose on the Church, near the commencement of our age, she seemed herself, for awhile, awestruck and lost in holy wonder and peaceful delight. The gowned prelate and the humblest dissenting presbyter,—the Methodist, the Baptist, the Quaker, the dullest formalist and the most raving fanatic, the Antinomian, the Arminian and even the Socinian,—all found themselves strangely met together, not for some dread and unearthly struggle for final supremacy, but, for the first time, on a common platform, and in the metropolis of Protestantism, in the presence of thousands of every name and grade, with blandest eye and accent, to greet each other as Christian brethren. Delight followed the surprise of so unwonted a meeting; and the surprise increased the delight. How they were all brought there, none could tell. A voice, better than that of the Hermit, seemed to have summoned them to a holier crusade against the common foe. Their pledges of unity appeared, and were sincere. The voice of their cordial greetings rolled far and wide through the ranks of their diverse communions, and were fondly—alas! too fondly—received as the pledge, not only of a new era in Chris-

tian activity, but also of a new dispensation, in which the voice of sectarian strife should be heard no more. And, indeed, for a season, a goodly one, the harsh notes of immemorial discord died away to a whisper. It was soon discovered, however, that the age for ending all controversy between religious sects had not yet come; (nor would we by any means intimate that the amicable discussion of disputed points, should ever be entirely dropped in this world;) it was found, or imagined to be found, that some sects had begun rather adroitly to avail themselves of the quiet truce, for the goodly purpose of bringing all Christendom into a still closer union,—an exact union with their *own right* views and usages. And, from that moment, whether it were suspicion or fact at first, the wild-fire again spread from sect to sect. For a long time, the voice of contention, if not so harsh and criminating in all sects, has been at least as strong and decided as ever. The temporary suspension, though followed to a good extent by the milder spirit it was fitted to infuse, has yet, by the blasting of hopes so fondly cherished, been likewise followed by a more deliberate and decided purpose, in perhaps every sect, to maintain its own ground and spread its dominion;—in some with more, in others with less of sectarian zeal and sectarian measures.

In the mean time, every sect has advanced with the rapid advance of our population. And their own increase is carefully registered by many of the sects, and loudly heralded in their periodical reports as though it were a proof that themselves are soon to fill the land. New sects, too, if really new sects there can now be, are rising up,—for instance, the Mormons,—all claiming to be the original and genuine stock of Israel.

And there is yet another circumstance bearing directly and strongly on our subject. Nearly all these sects are rapidly rising into eminence in regard to learning, as well as numbers. This is the fact, with more than one which, a few years ago, were glorying in their ignorance; now they have their theological seminaries. They discarded and contemned all traditionary evidence in respect to doctrinal truth and ecclesiastical rites and offices; now they are exploring the antiquities of the church, in zealous quest of proofs in support of their own peculiarities; and sentences from the early fathers grace their controversial pages and are familiarly rehearsed to their congregations.

Instead of complaining, however, we count it all joy that it is so. A resort to this additional and legitimate source of argu-

ment will ultimately have its benign and elevating effect on every sect. We only adduce the fact in its bearing on ecclesiastical literature. Every sect, if not every minister, has begun to feel its indispensable importance. The Baptist, the Congregationalist, the Presbyterian, the Quaker, the Prelatist—all zealously plead prescription. And even the Mormons not long since, employed an enlightened Jewish convert to teach them Hebrew! What, then, is to be the fate of that sect, if such there be, that shall neglect to defend itself against weapons drawn from the ancient arsenal? And how is this defence to be made, except by weapons from the same source? When the Protestant Reformers were overwhelming the Pope with this armor, he put the youthful Baronius in a course of training for this species of defence, and bade him devote his life to the writing of *Christian Annals* for the support of his tottering throne. And, next to political machinations and the civil sword, it proved its best support.

But this brings us to say, that we have controversies from without, that imperiously demand an acquaintance with the doctrines and usages of the early church. This same popery, if met at all to any good purpose, is still to be met with the sword of the Spirit in the right hand, and the shield of ecclesiastical history in the left. Both are indispensable to the success of any combatant in this long and recently reviving conflict. Prescription is here, indeed, the main plea. And who can deal with such an argument, without knowing the grounds on which it rests?

Infidels, too, and skeptics of every class, from the days of Voltaire and Gibbon and Hume, have delighted to assail Christianity within the citadel of her own literature. Generally, they hate the Word of God too bitterly to study it enough to learn even its more plausible points of assault. But history is often their delight, as it has been so extensively their triumphant boast. To glean the scandal of the church and her inconsistencies, and place them in their most revolting attitudes, and then charge the whole on Christianity itself, has been their favorite and most successful mode of warfare, from the early periods of Celsus and of Porphyry, down to the now famous Strauss, who is at this moment agitating Germany afresh by another publication,—“*The Christian Dogma in its contest with Science.*”

Nor are these contests confined to those who move in the

higher walks of literature. It is truly marvellous to see with what celerity the essence of some new moral malaria is invisibly wafted, by the prince of the power of the air, from a German or a French university to the lovely prairies of our far West. There our domestic missionary has to meet it in all its virulence ; and if too ignorant of the history of his own religion to comprehend or cope with the new difficulty, both he and his religion are branded afresh with the stigma of stupidity.

Nor are these contests, whether from within or without, merely so much matter of unmitigated regret. Like their own baleful instigator, they are yet made to subserve some useful purposes. They are the needful fire to burn up the wood, hay and stubble in the fabric of every sect, and of the whole church. What, we may ask, would that church have been, had she never been assailed by foes from abroad ? Just what, in many respects, the quiet dark ages were making her. For what friend would ever have had the heart to shiver her unsound arguments for the truth ? And who can tell the amount of paralyzing superstitions that would have continued to cluster around those spurious materials ?

But our limits, at the close of the present No., forbid a further pursuit of these topics, if we would reserve any space to speak of the work before us.

And truly, one of the many lessons we may learn from the facts now briefly presented, is that of the increasing need of this kind of books. General histories of the church, we have already in considerable number. But they are either too large and expensive for most readers, or altogether too defective, in the kind of information here presented. Mr. Coleman has given us a very judicious compendium of the rites, ceremonies, manners, polity, etc. of the early Christians, embodying a vast amount of matter in a simple and perspicuous style and form. The work does not profess to treat of *doctrinal* history, nor to give any connected view of the *general* history of the church ; but for the wide range of topics in regard to practice which it presents, it is exactly the sort of book which every minister and every student should have by him. It contains an explanation of numerous terms, and a full statement of innumerable things, which the common historian has no time to present. And some readers, especially those already acquainted with the general history of the church, may be deeply interested in reading it through in course.

Mr. Coleman has enjoyed the best helps in the compilation of his work, which Christian literature affords ; as will be seen by his preface and by a brief but valuable introduction to the work by Prof. Sears, of Newton Theol. Sem. And we are happy in being able to add, that he has availed himself of these helps to good purpose. Most of it is in the form of an abridged translation of the several portions selected from the more voluminous works of Augusti, Siegel and Rheinwald. We have compared the greater part of the first 200 pages with the originals, and are fully satisfied in respect to the general accuracy and faithfulness of Mr. Coleman's presentation of the views of his authors. He does not attempt a literal translation in all cases ; nor could he, consistently with his purpose of abridging their works as much as possible. We have noticed, indeed, a number of passages in which we think he has mistaken the meaning of the original. Nor would it be a difficult task to point out many instances in which we should prefer a different rendering of single words or phrases. But this is only a matter of course with any translation from a foreign language. Nor would the general reader be edified at all by a list of real or supposed errors, as he only wishes to be assured of the general trustworthiness of the performance ; and we shall have the means of informing Mr. C., in a more private way, of any emendations that would better please us in a future edition.

In comparing the translation, we have been struck, even more strongly than we anticipated, with the difficulty and extreme responsibility of the task Mr. C. has here assumed, of giving an abridgment of such a work as that of Augusti, and on such a subject. The great stress of the difficulty is in deciding as to what can be safely omitted. Augusti's first work was in twelve volumes. This he subsequently reduced to three large octavos. And for Mr. C. to abridge this abridgment to the limits of a single volume, without omitting any thing essential in a book designed for authoritative reference on points of controversy among jarring sects, must be seen by any one, who will make the comparison, to require no ordinary degree of knowledge, judgment and toil. Were not the original within our reach, we should have preferred to pay a higher price for a larger work ; but the present state of our reading public would hardly warrant the increase. At a future day, we hope Mr. C. or some other American will venture to give us about twice as large a work on the subject. We say *American*, for Americans

are the men to write books for *us*, in preference to Germans, or even Britons. *They* only know exactly what we need, and exactly how to speak to our ready comprehension. And whenever this shall be done, we hope the author, instead of giving a compilation, however good, will surround himself with the original works of the Christian fathers, together with all modern helps, and devote some five or ten years to the production of an original and standard work, on themes of such high and permanent importance to the general interests of Christian knowledge and so vital to the final adjustment of sectarian disputes. All that is needed is the requisite time, talent, judgment and truly Christian candor. And by the time such a work shall be produced, the public will doubtless be prepared to patronize it.

To show more definitely the extent and importance of the subjects here embraced, we subjoin the several captions to the twenty-three chapters into which Mr. C. has divided his work:—A general View of the Organization and Worship of the Primitive Church; Names and Classes of Christians; of the Ministers of the Church; of the Inferior Officers of the Church; Appointment to Ecclesiastical Offices; of the Rank, Rites, Privileges and Costume of the Clergy; of the Revenue of the Church and Maintenance of the Clergy; of Ordination; of Churches and Sacred Places; of the Prayers and Psalmody of the Church; Use of the Holy Scriptures in Religious Worship; of Homilies; of Catechetical Instructions; of Baptism; of Confirmation; of the Lord's Supper; of the Discipline of the ancient Church; Domestic and Social Character of the Primitive Christians; of Marriage; Funeral Rites and Ceremonies; Sacred Seasons, Festivals and Fasts; Sacred Seasons of the Puritans; of the Armenian Church.

The last two chapters are,—the one “from the hand of a distinguished antiquary and historian, the Rev. J. B. Felt, of Boston,” and the other from Rev. H. G. O. Dwight, one of our missionaries at Constantinople, where he has the best opportunities for a thorough knowledge of his subject. These two chapters are a very valuable addition to the work. That by Mr. Felt, on the history and reasons of our own sacred seasons, will be deemed invaluable by every genuine descendant of the Puritans. The fact that it does not strictly belong to “the Antiquities of the Church,” is rather an artificial than any real objection to its having a place in such a work.

Then comes an index of authorities, of no less than fifty-two

pages, to which references are made all along in the progress of the work, and by which the critical student will see the original authorities for the facts adduced, and will be guided to the best helps in the more extended researches he may wish to make on any of the topics. And to this are added a chronological list of councils to the middle of the ninth century ; and a chronological index of persons and events mentioned in the work, to the eighth century ; and finally, a general index of the whole work. These are quite full, occupying together about thirty pages, and will be a great help to the more illiterate reader, and will afford facilities to all in the work of occasional consultation. Nor must we here neglect to add, that for this last purpose, the Sabbath school teacher will find this work a great help in his important vocation.

The reader will not understand our warm commendation of the book as implying an indiscriminate approbation of all it contains. We are sorry, for instance, to find Augusti often vaguely and inconsistently speaking of infant baptism ; just as though it were first introduced some ages after the apostles. We say inconsistently, for when treating expressly on the topic, he very properly carries it back to the origin of Christianity. From this inconsistency, and from the manner in which most of the late German authors we have consulted speak on the subject, we cannot help suspecting that they have paid far less attention to this than to the other important topics of Christian antiquity ; and we hope the time is not distant in which some one will arise among them to write an entire and standard work on the early history of baptism, and do good justice to the theme. It is no strange thing for a German to be well acquainted with one subject, and sadly ignorant of another in the same general field of research.

As a specimen of the work, we subjoin the following from the section on "Disqualifications and Qualifications for Ordination."

The strictest precaution was exercised by the church to guard against the introduction of unworthy or unsuitable persons into the ministry. Several classes of persons were accordingly excluded from ordination, such as the following.

1. *Women.* This rule was in conformity with the apostolical precept, 1 Cor. 14: 34, 35, 1 Tim. 2: 11 seq. The appointment of deaconesses was no exception to this rule. They

were not appointed to bear rule, or to teach, but to perform certain offices which, from a due sense of decency and propriety, were restricted to their own sex. They were ordained with the usual formalities in the early periods of the church, but the custom was afterwards discontinued.

2. *Catechumens*. To this rule there were a few exceptions, as in the case of Ambrose, Nectarius, etc., but in general it was observed with great strictness.

3. *Neophytes, novices*; men who were deficient in age, or knowledge, or Christian experience. 1 Tim. 3: 6.

4. *Energumens*; including all who were subject to severe mental or bodily infirmities.

5. *Penitents*; all who for any offence had fallen under the censure of the church, even though they had been fully restored to the privileges of its fellowship and communion.

6. *Apostates*. All who lived a vicious life after baptism. Offences committed previously were not alleged as a disqualification.

7. *All who were devoted to theatrical pursuits*, or any occupations which disqualified them from receiving baptism.

8. *Slaves, and freedmen* who were still under some obligation to their former masters. This restriction was made not by reason of their humble condition, but because such persons could not be supposed to act with the freedom and independence which became the ministerial office.

9. *Soldiers and military men of every description*; for reasons substantially the same as those which are mentioned in the preceding article.

10. *Lawyers and civilians*. Men bearing civil offices, or in any way entangled with the affairs of state, were incapacitated for the sacred office. *Cavendum ab his est* (says Innocent I.), *propter tribulationem quod sæpe de his ecclesiæ provenit*. The power of Rome at times overruled this regulation, but the church uniformly sought to separate herself wholly from all connection with the state.

11. *All who were maimed, especially eunuchs*. *Non infirmitatem* (says Ambrose), *sed firmitatem*; *non victos, sed victores, postulat ecclesia*. To this rule there were exceptions.

12. *Persons who had contracted a second marriage*. This rule is based on an erroneous interpretation of 1 Tim 3: 2, and Tit. 1: 6. To these views of the church may be traced the ancient sentiments respecting the celibacy of the clergy, which prevailed as early as the fourth century, and in the twelfth required of them the vow of celibacy in the Roman Catholic church.

13. *Those who had received baptism upon their beds in ex-*

treme sickness, or under any urgent necessity when they might be suspected of having acted not voluntarily, but by constraint.

14. *They who had been baptized by heretics.* An exception, however, was made in favor of the Novatians and Donatists.

15. Persons who had been guilty of simoniacal conduct, i. e. of using bribery or any unfair means of obtaining ordination. This species of iniquity—the buying and selling of appointments to spiritual offices, and the obtaining of them by any unfair and dishonorable means—was severely censured by the church. The penalty was deposition from office, both on the part of him who was invested with holy orders, and of those who had assisted in his ordination. The laws of Justinian also required the candidate elect to make oath that he had neither given nor promised, nor would hereafter give, any reward directly or indirectly as a remuneration for aiding in his appointment.

The exceptions above mentioned are comprised in the following lines :

Aleo; venator; miles; caupo; anlicus; erro
Mercator; lanius; pincerna; tabellio; tutor,
Curator; sponsor; conductor; conciliator; pronexeta
Patronus causæ; procurator ve forensis;
In causa judex civili; vel capitali,
Clericus esse nequit, nisi Canones transgrediantur.

Besides the foregoing negative rules, there were others of a *positive character* prescribing the requisite qualifications for ordination.

1. *The candidate was required to be of a certain age.* The rules by which this canonical age was determined were undoubtedly derived from the Jewish rituals. The deacons were required to be of equal age with the Levites—twenty-five years. The canonical age of presbyters and bishops was the same as that of the priests of the Jews—thirty years. The Apostolical Constitutions prescribe fifty years as the canonical age of a bishop. This was afterwards reduced to thirty. In some instances, persons may have been introduced into the ministry at an age still earlier. Both Siricius and Zosimus required thirty years for a deacon, thirty-five for a presbyter, and forty-five for a bishop.

The age at which our Lord entered upon his ministry is frequently alleged as a reason for requiring the same age in a presbyter and bishop. That was usually the lowest canonical age. Children were sometimes appointed readers. The age of subdeacons, acolyths, and other inferior officers, was estab-

lished at different times, at fifteen, eighteen, twenty and twenty-five years.

2. *They were subject to a strict examination previous to ordination.* This examination related to their faith, their morals, and their worldly condition. They were especially subjected to the severest scrutiny in regard to the first particular. It was the duty of the bishop and subordinate officers of the clergy to conduct, for the most part, the examination ; but it was held in public, and the people also took a part in it. No one would be duly ordained without the concurrence of the people in this examination, and the united approbation both of them and the bishop. Cyprian also insists upon the concurrence of the people in the selection of a pastor, and offers as a reason, the consideration that they were more familiarly acquainted with the life and conversation of the candidate. The names of the candidates were published, in order that they might be subjected to a severer canvass by the people. By a law of Justinian, the candidate was required to give a written statement of his religious faith, in his own handwriting, and to take a solemn oath against simony.

The extracts in the margin show how carefully the church observed the apostolic injunction to lay hands suddenly on no man.

3. *No person could regularly be appointed to the higher offices of the church without having passed through the subordinate grades.* To this rule there were frequent exceptions, but the principle was strenuously maintained, in order that no one should assume the ministerial office until he had, in this way, become practically familiar with the whole system of ecclesiastical discipline and polity.

4. *Every one was to be ordained to some special charge.* This was supposed to be the apostolical rule, Acts 14: 33, Tit. 1: 5, 1 Pet. 5: 2. Exceptions sometimes occurred, though very rarely, and always against the decided sentiments of the church. Non-resident clergy, who are in this way removed from the watch and discipline of the church, receive no favor from the ancient canons and ecclesiastical writers.

5. *Every minister was required to remain in the diocese over which he was ordained ;* and no one could, at the same time, be invested with more than one office. Plurality of livings were unknown to the ancient church.

6. A clerical tonsure was made requisite about the fifth or sixth century. No mention is made of it before the fourth, and it is first spoken of with decided disapprobation.

In perfect consistency with these strict precautions against the introduction of unworthy persons into the sacred office, was the character of the discipline to which the clergy were subjected. This, in some respects, was more severe than that of private members of the church. The latter, if penitent, might regain their former standing, but the excommunicated or degraded minister could never be restored to the clerical order. The offences which exposed a clergyman to censure were numerous from the first; and they regularly increased as the purity of ancient Christianity diminished. Many of them originated in the peculiar trials to which primitive Christians were subject, and in the heresies and defections consequent upon them. We subjoin the following account of the punishments inflicted upon offending ministers during the first seven or eight centuries.

1. *Suspension.* This related either to the salary of the clergyman, or to his office. Both methods of punishment were practised by the ancient church. An instance is related in the writings of Cyprian of some whose monthly wages were suspended, while they were allowed to continue in the discharge of their office. Decrees to this effect were ordained by the councils of Nice, Ephesus and Agde.

Suspension from office was varied according to circumstances. At one time the offender was suspended from the performance of the active duties of his office, whilst he still retained his clerical rank with his brethren in the ministry. At another, he was forbidden to perform some of the duties of his office, while he continued in the discharge of others; and again, he was debarred the performance of all ministerial duties for a definite period of time.

2. *Degradation.* This punishment consisted, as its name implies, in removing the offender from a higher to a lower grade of office. This sentence of degradation appears to have been final and irrevocable. Bishops were in this manner transferred from a larger to a smaller or less important diocese. Presbyters were degraded to the order of deacons; and deacons, to that of subdeacons. This species of punishment was also inflicted upon bishops in Africa, by superseding them in their expected succession to the office of archbishop or metropolitan.

3. *Exclusion from the communion.* Of this there were two kinds, which were denominated *communio peregrina*, and *communio laica*. The former has sometimes been confounded

with the latter, or it has been supposed to denote a communion in one kind, or communion only at the point of death, which, in the Romish church, was regarded as a kind of passport to the future world. The most probable explanation of this point, confessedly obscure, is, that the term *communion* implied not only a participation in the eucharist, but in all the rights and privileges of a member of the church. Travellers and strangers, unless they had testimonials certifying to their regular standing in the church, were presumed to be under censure, and were not allowed the privileges of full communion, though permitted to receive, if need be, a maintenance from the funds of the church. An instance is related of Chrysostom, who on a certain occasion hospitably entertained the bishop of Alexandria, who had fled from persecution to him at Constantinople; but the bishop was not allowed to partake of the eucharist, until it had been fully ascertained that no just accusation could be brought against him. Clergymen under censure were sometimes treated in this way in their own communion. They were placed in the same relations as strangers, which was denoted by the phrase *communio peregrina*. Under these circumstances they could neither officiate nor be present at the celebration of the Lord's Supper, until they had given the prescribed satisfaction.

The act of communion was indeed the highest privilege of a layman; but it was a severe rebuke to one who had been elevated to the rank of the clergy to be again degraded to the condition of a layman, and to be required to communicate *as a layman* at the table of the Lord. This was a kind of mitigated excommunication. He was excluded from the body of the clergy and reduced to the condition of a humble individual. In this situation he was required to perform certain services for that same body from which he had been expelled. This was styled *communio laica*, and the subject of this penalty was said to be delivered over to the secular arm,—*curiæ tradi*,—in the phraseology of the ancient canonists.

4. *Imprisonment*. The custom of confining delinquent clergymen in monasteries appears to have taken its rise in the fourth and fifth centuries. At a later period it became a frequent mode of punishment.

5. *Corporal punishment*. This kind of punishment, together with the last mentioned, was inflicted only on clergy of the inferior orders. This mode of punishment was by no means unknown in the time of Augustine. A presbyter, who had been a false witness, could first be deposed from his office; and as a layman, might be subjected to corporal punishment.

Connected with the churches in large cities, such as Constantinople, there were houses of correction, *decanica*, for administering the correction of imprisonment and of corporal punishment.

6. *Excommunication*. This was the last and highest form of ecclesiastical censure. It cut off all hope on the part of the offender from ever being again reinstated in the ministry, even if he were restored to the fellowship of the churches. None who had at any time been exposed to public censure, were restored again to their office.

The above penalties appear to have been inflicted by authority of ecclesiastical councils alone, or at least to have been prescribed by them.

ARTICLE XI.

CRITICAL NOTICES.

- 1.—*The Nestorians ; or the Lost Tribes ; containing Evidence of their Identity, an Account of their Manners, Customs and Ceremonies, together with Sketches of Travel in ancient Assyria, Armenia, Media and Mesopotamia, and Illustrations of Scripture Prophecy*: by Asahel Grant, M. D. New-York, Harper & Brothers, 1841. pp. 385.

WE begin our notice of this book by expressing our high estimation of its value. It is intensely interesting and instructive. Dr. Grant, as our readers generally know, is one of the missionaries to Persia, sent out by the American Board of Foreign Missions. His work is a valuable accession to the vast amount of information, and even of critical and learned research, for which not only the Christian public, but the literary world is indebted to the published correspondence and other productions of the missionaries of that Board.

The first part of the volume,—130 pages,—contains an account of the author's travels and missionary labors, dangers and privations, from the spring of 1835 to 1840, during which he accomplished a more extensive exploration of the country of the Nestorians, than has been effected by any modern traveller. He went out as a physician, and by means of his profes-

sion was enabled to disarm the prejudices and secure the confidence of the warring and cruel tribes of the Koordish mountains, and obtain access to regions, where, in any other character, his life would have been in imminent peril. Many of the scenes and incidents of his travels are of thrilling interest, and his observation of the country, the customs and traditions of the people, etc. throws much light upon that ancient portion of the world.

But that which renders this work especially valuable is the evidence which it is supposed to contain of the identity of the Nestorians with the "Lost Tribes" of ancient Israel. Dr. Grant expresses great confidence that he has found, in the Nestorian Christians and the Jews of the same country, the remnant of the *Ten Tribes*, who were carried away captive into Assyria, by Shalmaneser, about 720 years before the birth of Christ. 2 Kings 17: 9—12. We have read this portion of the book with care, and most cordially commend it to our readers. It will richly reward a diligent perusal, and will be found in a high degree entertaining, as well as instructive. We are not, however, convinced that the *lost tribes* have really been found. Our author's arguments to this point, though rich in materials and ingeniously urged, are to us inconclusive. That our readers may see at a glance some of the ground of our hesitation, we add the following suggestions.

About 125 years after the captivity of Israel above referred to, Judah and Benjamin were also carried into captivity by Nebuchadnezzar, king of Chaldea. Jer. 39: 10, etc. Seventy years afterwards there was a restoration of a portion of the tribes of Israel to their native land, in which the tribes of Judah and Benjamin partook most largely. A large portion of the other tribes remained in captivity, and have become lost to history. By some means a presumption has been entertained that the *ten tribes*, thus lost, have still a separate existence, and that they will be restored, with the Jews, before the conversion of the Gentiles. This opinion is founded on various prophecies which speak of the return of the children of Israel, and which are supposed to be not yet fulfilled,—upon a statement of Josephus, that a large part of those tribes still resided east of the Euphrates in his day, and some other supposed allusions to the *ten tribes*, in the Scriptures and the Apocrypha. Several theories have accordingly been started on this subject, among which, in our own country, are those of Boudinot—"Star in the West,"—and Smith,—*"View of the Hebrews,"*—both of whom confidently urge the identity of the American Indians with the *lost tribes*. Dr. Grant maintains, with much

more plausibility, that the tribes in question have their separate existence among the mountains of Koordistan. We are ready, indeed, to grant, that, if these tribes are to be found anywhere,—if they are not lost and absorbed in the idolatrous nations to whom they were subjected,—our author has found them. His arguments are conclusive to prove that the Nestorians had a Jewish origin; but whether they are a remnant of the *ten* tribes, or of the *two*, or of the *twelve*, are questions not answered by the interesting witnesses here introduced; and we are driven back upon the inquiry, whether the expectation of finding the *lost tribes* is well founded,—whether the fulfilment of prophecy demands that they should be found anywhere, as a separate people? Some of the predictions quoted by Dr. Grant and others have respect as well to the two tribes as to the ten, and require their return to be simultaneous, and all of them seem to be capable of a similar application:—"I will cause the captivity of *Judah* and the captivity of *Israel* to return," etc. Jer. 33: 7. Whatever portion of these prophecies, therefore, remain yet to be fulfilled, we are inclined to look for their accomplishment in the conversion of both *Judah* and *Israel* to the faith of the Gospel. It is with this expectation, rather than with the idea that the ten tribes have still a separate existence in Persia and Koordistan, that we value the labors of our author. It is interesting, and confirmatory of the faith of the church to find so much evidence of the providential preservation, during so many centuries, of a band of early converts from Judaism, who, we may hope, through the strengthening hand of their brethren in more favored countries, will yet become as "life from the dead," to the Gentiles in the midst of whom they have been so wonderfully kept from falling into hopeless idolatry.

We forbear to pursue this subject farther, with the expectation of being favored with a review of Dr. Grant's work in season for our October No.

2.—*Lectures on Universalism.* By Rev. Joel Parker, D. D., President of the Union Theological Seminary, New-York. New-York: John S. Taylor & Co. 1841. pp. 192.

The principal part of this volume was written about thirteen years ago. Two editions have been exhausted, and the work has been out of print for several years. The author now presents it in a form somewhat more expanded and complete. His mode of discussing the subject may be learned from the titles of the several Lectures, which are as follows:—Direct

Arguments from the Scriptures; Examination of Arguments against Eternal Punishment; An Argument from the Providence of God towards the Righteous and the Wicked; Argument against Universalism deduced from its Moral Influence; Eternal Punishment not inconsistent with Divine Justice; Difficulty from the Divine Goodness considered. It will be seen at once, that Dr. Parker has not shaped his discussion with particular reference to the views of later Universalists. He supposes,—correctly we apprehend,—“that men first become Universalists by means of the arguments and objections specified in this volume.” It is well to follow this Protean error through all its changes; it is well occasionally to erect a battery against that perfect anomaly of creeds—modern Universalism; but it is not wise to leave the old battle-ground on which the victory has been so often won. Elsewhere, indeed, we may confound and silence our opponents; but here is almost the only spot where we can hope to convince. As an auxiliary to this end, the work of Dr. Parker will be exceedingly useful. The tone of the discussion is kind but manly, the reasoning lucid and unanswerable. Different opinions will be entertained as to the conclusiveness of this or that text of Scripture; but the argument as a whole is irresistible, and, if read with candor, cannot fail to do good.

3.—*Biblical Researches in Palestine, Mount Sinai and Arabia Petræa. A Journal of Travels in the year 1838, by E. Robinson and E. Smith, undertaken in reference to Biblical Geography. Drawn up from the Original Diaries, with Historical Illustrations, by Edward Robinson, D. D., Professor of Biblical Literature in the Union Theological Seminary, New-York, Author of a Greek and English Lexicon of the New Testament, etc. With new Maps and Plans in Five Sheets. In Three Volumes 8vo. Boston: Crocker & Brewster. New-York: Jona. Leavitt. London: John Murray. Halle: Waisenhausbuchhandlung. 1841. pp. 599, 679, 721.*

It is with no ordinary pleasure that we announce the appearance of this truly great work of our friend Dr. Robinson. Some foretastes of the “Journal” embraced in these volumes have already been furnished to our readers in preceding Nos. of the Repository. Our knowledge of the long cherished plans of the author, his ample qualifications for his undertaking, and the patience and faithfulness with which he is accustomed to pursue his investigations had raised our expectations high in respect to the result of his “Researches.” Our

anticipations, however, have been more than answered. We looked for a work on Biblical Geography, which should correct and verify the topography of the Holy Land. Such was the humble aim of our author. In respect to his journey in Palestine he remarks: "I entered upon it without the slightest anticipation of the results to which we were providentially led." He hoped, indeed, to satisfy himself by personal observation, as to many points on which the books of travellers gave no information. "But I never thought," he adds, "of adding any thing to the former stock of knowledge on these subjects; I never dreamed of any thing like discoveries in this field." In the progress of his researches, however, new subjects of inquiry were suggested, and objects undescribed by former travellers were constantly presenting themselves, and thus an unexpected amount of materials was accumulated in the Journals of our author and his companion, the Rev. E. Smith, out of which to construct a much larger and more extensive work than had been designed.

With these materials Dr. Robinson returned to Germany. They were too valuable and too deeply interesting to the cause of Biblical learning to justify his attempting their elucidation without the best historical and philological helps. The libraries of this country could not have furnished him the means of that investigation which their importance seemed to demand. He accordingly, during the whole preparation of his volumes for the press, remained in Berlin, where, in the unrestricted use of the Royal Library and the very valuable private collections of Ritter, Neander and Hengstenberg, he enjoyed all the literary means he could desire. The result is that the three volumes, now given to the public by an American citizen, contain a mass of information, Biblical, Geographical, Historical and Critical, which places this work in the highest rank of the learned productions of the age, and confers an honor, which we ought not lightly to esteem, upon our country.

These volumes, however, valuable as they are in themselves, the author wishes may "be regarded merely as a beginning, a first attempt to lay open the treasures of Biblical Geography and History still remaining in the Holy Land,—treasures which have lain for ages unexplored, and had become so covered with the dust and rubbish of many centuries, that their very existence was forgotten." Mr. Smith has returned to the seat of his labors in Beirût, taking with him instruments of the best kind, in the hope of being able, in his occasional journeys, to verify and correct the former observations of himself and

Dr. R., and also to extend his examination to other parts of the country. From the materials thus to be gathered, together with those already in possession, our author intends hereafter to prepare "a systematic work on the physical and historical Geography of the Holy Land."

On the whole, it is rarely the privilege of the periodical press, in any country, to announce a publication so rich in the materials of important knowledge, and so full of promise in respect to its progressive improvement and diffusion, as the work now before us. To the Biblical student and the Christian scholar it opens sources of instruction, new, unexpected, and in the highest degree interesting. But we have not space in the present notice for an analysis of these volumes, and we abstain from any discussion of their merits in detail, having reason to expect a review, from a competent hand, in season for our October No.

In justification of the high terms of commendation, in which we have felt it our duty, after a very brief examination of this work, to introduce it to our readers, we add the following extract of a letter from Professor Ritter of Berlin, the perusal of which we have solicited, and which our author, we hope, will excuse us for inserting without his permission. It is the testimony of a German Professor of "Universal Geography," whose opinion, on this subject, possesses the highest authority. It is contained in a friendly letter addressed to Dr. Robinson, dated Berlin, March 2, 1841.

"I cannot often enough repeat, what an uncommon amount of instruction I owe to the invaluable work you have left us here. It lays open, unquestionably, one of the richest discoveries, one of the most important scientific conquests, which has been made for a long time in the field of Geography and Biblical Archæology. I can at present say this the more decidedly; because, having had opportunity to examine the printed sheets nearly to the end of the second volume, I can better judge of the connection of the whole, than was before possible. Now, however, I perceive, how one part sustains another; and what noble confirmation the truth of the Holy Scriptures receives from so many passages of your investigations, in a manner altogether unexpected and often surprising, even in particulars seemingly the most trivial and unimportant. The accompanying Maps, too, justify, step by step, the course of the investigations.

"Thus now first begins, since the days of Reland, the second great epoch of our knowledge of the Promised Land. You

can well afford to return to your home, fully satisfied with the rich harvest of your journey. The blessing of every student of the Holy Scriptures will follow you. Above all I admire your devoted perseverance in these inquiries. How providential, too, for you, that you could thus travel in Palestine immediately before the entanglements and troubles of the oriental question !”

The Third volume contains 246 pages of appendices, in which are found a Chronological list of works on Palestine and Mount Sinai, with some account of their history and contents, memoirs of maps, etc., an Itinerary exhibiting the routes and general rate of travel of our Journalists, an Essay on the pronunciation of the Arabic, by Mr. Smith, lists of Arabic names of places in Palestine and the adjacent regions, etc.

The maps intended to accompany the work were drawn up in Berlin, and will no doubt be found in accordance with the best Geographical authorities. We will only add, that this work, as is intimated on the title-page, is published simultaneously in Germany, England and the United States. The copy before us is in the best style of the American press. Mr. Trow, the printer, has here turned to a good account his recently procured and beautiful founts of Greek, Hebrew and Arabic type.

4.—*A Classical Dictionary ; containing an Account of the principal Proper Names mentioned in Ancient Authors, and intended to elucidate all the important points connected with the Geography, Biography, History, Mythology and Fine Arts of the Greeks and Romans : together with an Account of Coins, Weights and Measures, with Tabular Values of the same. By Charles Anthon, L. L. D., Jay Professor of the Greek and Latin Languages in Columbia College, New-York, and Rector of the Grammar-School. New-York: Harper & Brothers, 1841. pp. 1430.*

The author of this comprehensive and useful volume, it is well known, has bestowed much time and study, within the last few years, on the different topics embraced within the plan of a Classical Dictionary. The work of Lempriere was published in 1788; and its popularity was soon established. A second edition appeared in 1792, a third in 1797, and others followed at intervals of five or six years. In 1825, Prof. Anthon was requested to prepare a new edition of Lempriere ;

without venturing, however, on extensive changes, his alterations were restricted to the more obvious mistakes and defects of the original work. But another edition was soon called for, which, owing to the numerous improvements introduced into it, was republished in England. In 1833, still another edition was issued, in two volumes, containing the results of Prof. Anthon's more recent investigations.

It will be seen at a glance that the author has been gradually and laboriously preparing himself for this new and improved Classical Dictionary. In addition to the time bestowed on Lempriere, he informs us in his Preface, that "the patient labor of more than two entire years has been faithfully expended" on the present work; "which, though compressed in a single volume, will be found to contain much more than the edition of Lempriere in two volumes, as published by the Messrs. Carvill."

The principal topics illustrated by Prof. Anthon are the Geography, History, Biography, Mythology and Fine Arts of the Greeks and Romans. The subject of Archæology he has reserved for a "Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities," to be prepared "with all convenient speed." He has devoted very great attention to Ancient Geography. He thinks "that in no work in the English language will there be found a larger body of valuable information, on this most interesting subject, than in that which is here offered to the American student." Next to Ancient Geography, the Mythology of Antiquity has furnished the largest number of articles. It has been his aim to present an impartial view of the two great schools,—the Mystic and Anti-mystic,—which now divide the learned of Europe. In preparing these articles special care has been taken, by the exclusion of every thing gross and offensive, to adapt the work to the young of both sexes. The historical and biographical departments have been amply illustrated. The later speculations of English and German scholars, respecting the origin of nations, may be found in different parts of the volume. The biographies of distinguished individuals are intended to exhibit an outline of the literature, philosophy and fine arts of antiquity.

In its execution the work is such as was to be expected from the extensive attainments and indefatigable industry of Prof. Anthon. Its great superiority to previous Classical Dictionaries is everywhere apparent. At the same time that innumerable topics, which are treated by Lempriere very briefly and vaguely, if at all, are here illustrated with copious and varied erudition, the greatest care has been taken to exclude

those offensive, pernicious and disgusting details which are too common in works of this description. The author has been too conscientious and considerate to enrich his volume at the expense of delicacy and morality. Those who are familiar with this department of learning will suggest, perhaps, some improvements both in the plan and execution of his labors. If permitted to continue his researches, Prof. Anthon will himself feel, we have no doubt, that he can at some future day make a more perfect exhibition of the subjects here discussed. But he richly deserves, for what he has already done, the thanks of every friend of a thorough classical education.

5.—*History of the Establishment and Progress of the Christian Religion in the Islands of the South Sea ; with preliminary notices of the Islands and of their Inhabitants. Illustrated by a map.* Boston: Tappan & Dennet. New-York: Gould, Newman & Saxton. Philadelphia: Henry Perkins. 1841. pp. 398.

While it is the condemnation of some books that they come from a hand which is too easily recognized, it is the misfortune of others to be anonymous. To the latter class belongs the volume before us. We commenced its perusal with many misgivings as to its character and worth. It is so uncommon for the writer of a valuable work to suppress his authorship, that the absence of a responsible name is presumptive evidence of conscious demerit. But this presumption was soon rebutted by satisfactory evidence of a happy combination of those qualities which are essential to a good compiler. We regret that we are not at liberty to give the name of the accomplished authoress, to whom the public are so much indebted.

The design of the work is to present a clear and connected view of the progress of missions in the islands of the South Sea. Interesting accounts, describing the triumphs of the gospel in those distant lands, have been published from time to time ; but few of these can be regarded as accessible to the majority of readers in this country. It is the aim of this volume to place the substance of their contents within the reach of all. The first four chapters are taken up with a general description of the islands, and the condition of the inhabitants prior to the introduction of Christianity. The remaining chapters are devoted to the progress of religion in connection with the labors of the London Missionary Society. The work deserves an extensive circulation ; ministers may derive much assistance from it in preparing for the monthly concert ; and no Sabbath-school should be without it.

- 6.—*Christian Experience, as displayed in the Life and Writings of Saint Paul. By the Author of "Christian Retirement." First American from the seventh London Edition.* New-York: John S. Taylor. 1841. pp. 418.

No character, whether of ancient or modern history, is more deserving of profound study than that of Paul. To the philanthropist and the Christian, he presents a striking illustration of the spirit and aims of genuine benevolence. To the preacher of the gospel, he may be safely recommended as a model of fidelity, zeal and fervor. In no other man do we find such a delightful combination of apparently conflicting qualities. It is a matter of surprise that some master in the delineation of character has not applied his skill to this noble subject. We have admirable sketches of isolated features, but no complete and finished picture.

This particular desideratum it is not the design of the present volume to supply. In his Preface, the author observes that "this little treatise has no pretensions to novelty, being on subjects which form the daily meditation of the devout Christian, and from which he derives his purest enjoyments; neither does the author presume to vie with those whose works on the life of St. Paul have enriched the stores of sacred literature. His design in publishing these thoughts on the experience of the Apostle is, in some feeble measure, to exhibit the beauty of evangelical religion; by bringing into one view the varied excellencies of his character, and by unfolding those principles of faith and love, which, through the Spirit, made him so great a blessing to mankind. Christianity is the religion of the heart. Every doctrine of the gospel is a sacred spring of holiness. In these pages, the author has therefore endeavored to treat these mysteries of grace, not controversially, but practically; not as subjects of speculation, but as sources of peace and joy." The design and spirit of the volume are highly commendable. Indeed it is sufficient to say, that this is "the first American from the seventh London edition."

- 7.—*A Refutation of sundry Baptist Errors, particularly as they are set forth in a recent work of Rev. J. J. Woolsey, and in the third Annual Report of the Am. and For. Bible Society. By Edwin Hall, Pastor of the First Congregational Church, Norwalk, Ct.* Norwalk: John A. Weed. New York: Gould, Newman and Saxton; Robinson, Pratt and Co. 1841. pp. 156.

It is a matter of profound regret, that ministers of the

gospel should ever be required to engage in religious controversy. In this feeling, we have no doubt, the author of this volume fully participates. Still he has felt himself obliged to resist the assaults, which have been made upon what he considers "the truth and ordinance of God." In our Oct. No. for 1840, we noticed his "Exposition of the Law of Baptism." This "Refutation of Baptist Errors" he has undertaken to meet the wants of the people of his charge. The first half of the volume relates more particularly to the translation of βαπτίζω; and he shows, by pointing out the mistakes and even the contradictions of our Baptist brethren, that the confidence with which they have spoken on the subject is altogether unwarranted. The remainder of the work is occupied with the exposure of various misstatements and errors in respect to infant baptism. The whole discussion is clear, forcible and dignified; and it embodies many facts and considerations which are not to be found elsewhere in so convenient a form.

8.—*Incidents of Travels in Central America, Chiapas and Yucatan*: by John L. Stephens, author of "*Incidents of Travel in Egypt, Arabia Petræa and the Holy Land*," etc. Illustrated by numerous Engravings. In Two Volumes. 8vo. New-York: Harper & Brothers, 1841. pp. 424, 474.

In these volumes we are called to notice another splendid American work. Few writers of travels, who have come so recently before the public, have been so extensively read, and so much admired, as our young and enterprising fellow-citizen, Mr. Stephens. His popularity has been occasioned in part by the intrinsic interest of the scenes and countries to which his thirst for knowledge and his adventurous spirit have led him forth, on his distant and perilous journeyings; but not less, perhaps, by his happy talent at description, the ease and versatility of his style, and an enthusiasm which gives life and spirit to his narrative, irresistibly drawing the reader into sympathy with himself, and making him, as it were, a fellow-traveller. Those of our readers who are familiar with the "*Incidents of Travel*," by this author, "*in Egypt, Arabia Petræa and the Holy Land*," "*in Greece, Turkey, Russia, and Poland*," will appreciate the correctness of these remarks, and rejoice to take another voyage, with a companion and guide whom they have accompanied with so much pleasure in his former excursions.

Our traveller, however, in the present work, brings tidings not from the *Old* world, but from the *New*. Let not the reader

be deceived by this contrast of *Old* and *New*. We here speak after the manner of men. Enlightened men, men of learning and of civilization,—the whole world, as it is known to history,—have looked upon the American continent as new,—new to civilization and its arts and refinements. But he who sitteth upon the circuit of the heavens, and keepeth record of the world's history, has doubtless watched over and directed the rise and fall of empires, and the lapse of centuries and millenaries, as well on the Western as on the Eastern continent. Some traces of these are discoverable by us. They are found, not on the pages of written history, but in the rude mounds and monuments which remain in our own country; and from the time of the conquest of Mexico by Cortez, some accounts have been preserved of the monuments and architectural remains of the aborigines of South America. These accounts, however, have been esteemed as worthy of but little credit. Dr. Robertson, in his *History of America*, (1777,) as quoted by Mr. Stephens, considers it certain "that America was not peopled by any nation of the ancient continent which had made any considerable progress in civilization," that the inhabitants were "unacquainted with those arts which are the first essays of human ingenuity in its advance towards improvement."

Since Dr. Robertson's time, however, new light has been thrown upon this subject, through the discoveries of the learned Humboldt, who travelled somewhat extensively in South and Central America, about the beginning of the present century, and others. But the ruins of ancient cities and structures in Mexico were especially brought to the consideration of Europe and this country, by the report of Colonel Galindo, who visited the ruins of Copan in 1836, under commission from the Central American government, and the results of whose examination were published in the proceedings of the Royal Geographical Society of Paris and in the *London Literary Gazette*. But his account Mr. Stephens regards as unsatisfactory, though not exaggerated; and his drawings of the monuments were necessarily imperfect, from the fact of his not being an artist.

Our space will not allow us to enlarge upon what was before known of these ruins, or of the others described by our author, and which we hasten to notice. This voyage of discovery was undertaken with peculiar advantages and facilities. Mr. Stephens was intrusted by the President of the United States with a special, confidential Mission to the Government of Central America; which, though not always an effectual

security against suspicion and assault, in the then distracted state of the country, was, in several cases, of essential service. He was also peculiarly fortunate in having engaged, as his companion and helper, Mr. Catherwood, well known as an experienced artist, and who had spent more than ten years in studying and sketching the antiquities and architectural structures of the Old world. Thus associated our travellers left New-York in October, 1839, and were absent ten months; nearly eight of which they spent in exploring the country of Central America, from the Gulf of Mexico and the Bay of Honduras to the Pacific Ocean, and in examining and sketching the wonderful monuments of its ancient greatness.

The report of the whole is given in these, so called, "Incidents of Travel." But with all due respect to the taste of our author, we must regard the title of his work a misnomer. *Incidents* it does indeed contain,—many, amusing, surprising, perplexing, and interwoven with the whole thread of his narrative. But this is not all. It brings before us substantial facts and venerable realities, by the side of which the mere incidents of a journey, however thrilling and entertaining, for the moment, are trifles soon to be forgotten. These constitute the principal value of the work.

First, we place ourselves by the side of these explorers amid the ruins of the ancient city of Copan, three hundred miles from the ocean, on the bank of a river not navigable even for canoes, except for a short time in the rainy season, and in the midst of a dense forest,—the remains of the city extending along the river more than two miles,—its front wall, of cut stone, from sixty to ninety feet high. Behind it are ranges of stone steps and pyramidal structures, rising from thirty to one hundred and forty feet high on the slope. Standing among the trees are numerous pillars of stone, each a single block, carved with the most exquisite and elaborate workmanship, exhibiting portraits of men and women, and figures of, perhaps, idols in front, and on the sides numerous hieroglyphics. These pillars are from ten to twenty feet high and from three to four in diameter, and stand upon pedestals of stone. In front of each is an altar of stone, some of which are also elaborately carved with hieroglyphics. Of these monuments, as well as of the plan of the city, accurate drawings were taken by Mr. Catherwood, which have since been engraved on steel at great expense, in the best style of the London artists, and accompany the description by Mr. Stephens in these volumes. Several other ruins of less interest are described.

The next most important ruin brought to view and illustra-

ted with engravings is that of Utalan, which, according to Spanish historians, was once the most populous city of the kingdom of Guatemala. The monuments here remaining are scarcely less interesting than those of Copan. At other places our travellers describe pyramidal structures of more than a hundred feet at the base, curiously wrought vessels, images and sacrificial altars, which are also accurately engraved. But we hasten to the only remaining ruin which we have space to notice. It is a city, the existence of which was entirely unknown until 1750, when it is said to have been discovered by some wandering Spaniards. It is not known by what name it was called, and the only appellation now given to it is Pelanque. It is in the province of Chiapas, and its ruins are spread over an extent of from eighteen to twenty-four miles. An account of these ruins, taken under a commission from the Spanish government in 1807, was published in Paris, in 1834, in a splendid and costly work illustrated with numerous engravings. But our author claims for Mr. Catherwood's drawings a decided preference as to accuracy, over the plates contained in the above work, and adds:—"As to the most of the places visited by us, the reader will find no materials whatever except those furnished in these pages."

Any attempt here to describe the numerous monuments and immense structures at Pelanque would far exceed our limits. Many of them are very unlike those at Copan, and their design and origin are equally mysterious and wonderful. The hieroglyphics, however, are the same, indicating that this country was once inhabited by a race speaking the same language, or at least having the same written characters. But whence came they? From what tribe or lineage of the Old world were they broken off? Is not their history written upon these monuments? And will not some Champollion decipher and read it to the nations?

We are overwhelmed with the wonders disclosed in these volumes; and cannot but indulge the pleasing hope that they will be found to contain sources of veritable history concerning the antiquities of our country. But while we readily award to our author the credit of a discoverer, in some parts of his work, we are persuaded, with him, that there are yet other architectural remains embosomed in the forests of that country, hereafter to be discovered.

A Padre assured him of the existence of a city in the province of Vera Paz, deserted and desolate, and almost as perfect as when evacuated by its original occupants. He was also told of another city now occupied by its aboriginal in-

habitants in the midst of a tribe of Indians south of Chiapas, who have never yielded to the Spanish arms, and over which the government of Central America attempts no control. These, if they exist, as Mr. S. believes they do, will be found by some future traveller, who, as our author remarks, "will experience sensations which seldom fall to the lot of man." In the mean time we commend the present work to our readers, as an admirable introduction to the study of American antiquities. The printing, as well as the engravings, is executed in superior style, and it is in all respects a splendid result of individual enterprise, which will confer honor both upon the author and his country.

9.—*Introduction to the Literature of Europe in the Fifteenth, Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries: by Henry Hallam, F. R. A. S., Corresponding Member of the Academy of Moral and Political Sciences in the French Institute.* In two Volumes, large 8vo. New-York: Harper and Brothers. 1841. pp. 416, 462.

Hallam's "View of the state of Europe during the Middle Ages" was published by the Messrs. Harpers, in 1837. About the same time the first volume of the work, whose title is given above, appeared in London, and was noticed by us in connection with Harpers' edition of the "Middle Ages," in the Repository for January, 1838. The remaining three volumes of the London edition were published in 1839, and an able and thorough review of the whole, selected from the British and Foreign Review, will be found in the American Eclectic for the present month,—No. IV,—to be concluded in the No. for September next. The American edition now before us embraces the four volumes in two, which are executed in a manner combining economy with good taste and durability; the size of the type and page, and the style of binding being the same as those of the "Middle Ages," by the same publishers.

Those who have read the former work of Mr. Hallam have cherished high expectations in respect to this new and welcome accession to critical literature. These expectations, we are now confident, will be fully answered and gratified by the appearance of the work which is the subject of our present notice. It embraces a period of rich and varied materials of literary history, and which are of special importance on account of their bearings and traceable influences upon the present state of knowledge and civilization in the nations of Europe, and, of course, among ourselves. It is within the

three centuries here explored that we are to look for the beginnings of many of the steps which have since marked the progress of improvement in some nations, and of occasional or temporary decline in others, and for many of those causes, whose results are still in the process of development. The history of this period is naturally divided from that of the Middle Ages, by the invasion of Naples by Charles VIII, in the fifteenth century. This, says our author, "was the event that first engaged the principal states of Europe in relations of alliance or hostility, which may be deduced to the present day, and is the point at which every man who traces backward its political history will be obliged to pause." (Pref. Mid. Ages, p. x.) Starting from this point, Mr. Hallam proceeds with his history, taking up in order, and with distinct conceptions of their influences upon each other, the several nations of Europe, and tracing, with the confidence of one deeply learned in his subject, the several departments of their literature.

To the literature of this period, as a whole, nothing like justice had before been attempted to be done in our language. On some sections of it, learned and elaborate works had been written,—the "*Bibliotheca Universalis*," by Gesner, the "*Bibliotheca Selecta*," by Possevin, the "*Prodromus Historiæ Literariæ*," by Lambecius, Morhof's "*Polyhistor*," etc. etc. These were all examined together with many later works, on parts of the numerous topics discussed by our author. On the whole a surprising amount of learning is made tributary to the elucidation of the progress of the human mind during the three centuries to whose literature we are introduced in these centuries; and the spirit of the author,—though sometimes, as we think, in his anxiety to avoid the appearance of a partisan bias, he falls into the opposite extreme, and does great injustice to such men as Luther and others, whose partisanship was bold in defence of the truth,—is nevertheless in general candid, and his judgment, worthy of confidence. An analysis of a work embracing so great a variety of topics would occupy more space than we can allot to this notice, and would be of little use, as we doubt not that all of our readers, who can, will procure and read the work.

10.—*An Argument for the Perpetuity of the Sabbath.* By Rev. A. A. Phelps. Boston: D. S. King. 1841. pp. 164.

This Argument in defence of the Christian Sabbath was occasioned by the discussions of the "Church, Ministry and Sabbath Convention," held in Boston on the 18th of Nov. 1840.

Having participated in those discussions, the author was requested to write out and publish his remarks. This he has done, introducing, however, new trains of thought, and expanding others at which he merely glanced in the hurry of debate. His main purpose has been to establish two propositions: 1, the Sabbath is coeval with our race; 2, the substitution of the first day of the week for the seventh is divinely authorized. The argument is particularly adapted to meet the more recent objections which have been brought against this institution. It is an ingenious and successful vindication of the truth.

11.—*Godly Meditations upon the Most Holy Sacrament of the Lord's Supper.* By Christopher Sutton, D. D., late Prebend of Westminster. With a Preface by J. H. Newman, B. D., Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford. New-York: D. Appleton & Co. 1841. pp. 335.

12.—*Disce Mori:—Learn to Die.* By Christopher Sutton, D. D., late Prebend of Westminster. New-York: D. Appleton & Co. 1841. pp. 310.

Respecting the author of these volumes, very little is known. He is supposed to have been born about 1565. He entered Oxford University in 1582; in 1587, he was ordained and presented to the vicarage of Raneham, in the county of Essex; in 1588, he became rector of Caston, in Hampshire. In 1605, James I. had made him a prebendary of the Abbey Church of St. Peter's, Westminster, in consequence of his eloquence as a preacher. The only works which he published were his *Disce Vivere*, *Disce Mori* and *Godly Meditations*. These were all very popular in the 17th century. In 1677, the last of these had reached its thirteenth edition.

The two works whose titles we have given above are written in the genuine spirit of the epoch in which their author lived. With fewer defects of style than most writers of that period, he has something of their quaintness and much of their shrewdness. With less affluence of illustration and less splendor of imagery than Jeremy Taylor, he exhibits the same delightful spirit. The work on the Sacrament is practical and devotional. Its object is to assist the believer in directing his meditations before, during and after his approaches to this ordinance. Though somewhat diffuse and immethodical at times, it abounds in useful thought, and its serious perusal cannot fail to do good. The *Disce Mori*, in plan and execution, is similar to the *Godly Meditations*. Both volumes are

printed in that beautiful style of typography, which we had occasion to commend in our notice of Patrick's Hearts' Ease and Wilson's Sacra Privata.

- 13.—*The Natural History of Society in the Barbarous and Civilized State: An Essay towards discovering the Origin and Course of Human Improvement*, by W. Cooke Taylor, Esq. LL. D. M. R. A. S. of Trinity College, Dublin. Vols. I, II. New-York: D. Appleton & Co. 1841. pp. 332, 328.

This work, we observe, has been favorably noticed in the English Reviews. We are glad to see it so soon issued by an American publisher. It embraces a pleasing variety of curious and interesting topics; and though it is not remarkable for the originality of its views, it exhibits evidences of a commendable extent of research, and embodies many philosophical considerations and conclusions respecting the numerous and diversified facts which are here brought together both in combination and contrast. The subjects discussed in these volumes are—Characteristics and Tendencies of Barbarism and Civilization,—Social Relations, Property, Personal Security,—State of Nature,—War, Indigence,—Superstitious Customs,—Varieties of Savage Life, its Arts,—Evidences of Lost Civilization, its Remains in North and South America, Scripture Account of its Origin, described in the book of Job,—Egyptian Civilization, also Babylonian and Assyrian, Persian, Phœnician and Carthaginian, Grecian and Roman Civilization,—Polytheism,—Christianity and its Influence on Civilization,—the Overthrow of the Roman Empire, its Effects,—Progress of Civilization during the Middle Ages,—Circumstances contributing to its advancement, etc. Some of these chapters we have read with interest, particularly those on lost civilization, in which the conclusions of the author, though published before the report of the discoveries of Messrs. Stevens and Caterwood in Central America, will be much strengthened by the remains of ancient art and greatness, which those enterprising travellers have brought to the consideration of the learned world. The chapters on the origin of civilization, as indicated in the Old Testament, and the influence of Christianity upon its increase and extension, are especially good. But we have no space to extend our remarks, and must close by commending the work to our readers, as well worthy of the beautiful style in which Mr. Appleton has brought it before the American public.

- 14.—*Themes for the Pulpit ; being a collection of nearly three thousand Topics with Texts, suitable for Public Discourses in the Pulpit and Lecture Room ; mostly compiled from the published Works of ancient and modern Divines. By Abraham C. Baldwin. New-York: M. W. Dodd. 1841. pp. 324.*

The object and the utility of this book are obvious from the title. The compiler observes with truth that "there are few clergymen who have not at times found it more difficult to select an interesting and useful subject, than to prepare a sermon after a suitable subject has been found." To aid his brethren in such circumstances has been his design in preparing this volume. It has no affinity with books of "Skeletons," and "Outlines of Sermons." It is a naked collection of subjects, accompanied with texts of Scripture, and the names of the authors from whom they have been taken. For those who are young in the ministry in particular, Mr. Baldwin has performed a valuable service.

- 15.—*The Philosophy of History ; in a Course of Lectures, by Frederick von Schlegel. With a Memoir of the Author, by James B. Robertson, Esq. In two volumes. New-York: D. Appleton & Co. 1841. pp. 319, 302.*

Every student of history will do well to read these volumes ; not that every sentiment which they contain is correct, but while many of the opinions here advanced are sound and just, even those which are questionable will reward a careful examination. With all the misdeeds of his political and literary career, it must be admitted that Schlegel had some rare qualifications for writing the *philosophy* of history. In addition to those extensive attainments which are common to the first scholars of Germany, he possessed an acquaintance with Asiatic learning, equally varied and profound. History, moreover, was his favourite study. To whatever subject his attention was directed, its bearing on the intellectual and social development of our race was diligently scrutinized. The *Philosophy of History*, it should be remembered, was undertaken in the full maturity of his vigorous and cultivated mind. Indeed these Lectures were the last production which he lived to finish. Having completed their delivery in 1828, he repaired to Dresden near the close of the year, and commenced a course on the *Philosophy of Language*. While writing the tenth Lecture, his labors were arrested, and he died Jan. 12th, 1829.

The first two Lectures of the work before us embrace the

relation of man to the earth, the division of mankind into nations, and the twofold condition of humanity in the primitive world. In the seven succeeding Lectures are considered the antiquity and institutions of China, the mental culture and philosophy of the Hindoos, the science and corruption of Egypt, the privileges and destinies of the Hebrews, the Persians with their nature-worship, manners and conquests, the Greeks with their learning and power, the Romans with their universal dominion. The next five Lectures treat of Christianity,—its consolidation and diffusion,—the emigration of the Germanic tribes, the Saracens in the brilliant age of the Caliphs, the establishment of a Christian empire in Germany, the great schism of the West, the struggles of the middle age, the Crusades, the discovery of the new world. The three following Lectures are devoted to religious wars, Illuminism, the French Revolution; and the last Lecture considers the prevailing spirit of the age and the universal regeneration of society.

The translator of these volumes is a warm admirer of Schlegel, particularly, it would seem, because of the latter's conversion to Catholicism. But his qualifications for the work he has undertaken are certainly not of the highest order.

15.—*Psychology ; or a View of the Human Soul, including Anthropology, adapted for the use of Colleges.* By Rev. Frederick A. Rauch, D. P., Late President of Marshall College, Penn. Second Edition, Revised and Improved. New York: M. W. Dodd. Boston: Crocker & Brewster. Philadelphia: Thomas, Coperthwait & Co. 1841. pp. 401.

By turning to our notice of the first edition of this work,—*Repository*, July, 1840,—our readers will perceive that the present edition has been enlarged by about thirty pages. The additions and changes which have been made, as far as we have been able to examine them, we regard as improvements in the style and finish of the work. They were principally made by the author's own hand; though he had not quite completed his revision, when it pleased God to arrest his useful and important labors by the hand of death. His decease in the midst of his career is an event which we record with no ordinary feelings of sorrow. In it we have ourselves been called to mourn the loss of a personal friend and helper in our work, while the country has been deprived of one of its most thoroughly educated and accomplished scholars. The Institution over which he presided, the church, and the cause of educa-

tion and learning are deeply affected by the removal of one so highly gifted, from so wide a sphere of present and prospective usefulness. But his works will remain to perpetuate, in some degree, the influence which his living labors were beginning to exert. The present volume has been issued under the critical eye of Professor Nevin, of the same Institution, from whose preliminary notice we learn that a systematic work on *Moral Philosophy*, which was nearly prepared by Dr. Rauch, and intended to follow his *Psychology*, will probably be given to the public.

16.—*Remarks on the "Oxford Theology," in connection with its bearing upon the Law of Nature and the Doctrine of Justification by Faith.* By Vanbrugh Livingston. New-York: John S. Taylor. 1841. pp. 227.

The author of this little volume is a highly respectable and educated layman, and, as we understand, a member of the Episcopal church. But we have not heretofore known him as a writer on Theology. He now appears, however, as a defender of the Oxford Divines, especially against the imputations cast upon them by Bishop McIlvaine, in his work which we noticed with commendation in our No. for January last, and also against some strictures on the Oxford Divinity in a late No. of the Princeton Review. His work is a continuous discussion, without any break or division into chapters; and we have found it difficult to divide it into parts for the purpose of an analysis. Its aim is single and its argument repetitious. The writer professes not to have read the whole of the "Tracts for the Times," and disavows an entire agreement in all the views of the Oxford writers. But in respect to the Doctrine of Justification by Faith, on which Bishop McIlvaine charges them with holding the prominent error of the church of Rome, in opposition to the doctrine of the Anglican church, our author maintains that the charge is unfounded, and that, on the contrary, the views of Oxfordism on this subject are sustained by the Thirty-nine Articles. Here he takes his ground boldly with the Oxford writers. His views, however, according to our conceptions, are far from being discriminating and just. Regeneration, justification and sanctification are so confounded together, that the real difference between his positions and those which he opposes is often unintelligible; and his reasoning, though respectable, is on the whole unsatisfactory.

- 18.—*The Moral Influences, Dangers and Duties connected with Great Cities.* By John Todd. Northampton: J. H. Butler. Philadelphia: Smith & Peck. Boston: Crocker & Brewster; A. D. Phelps. 1841. pp. 267.

This little volume has been written, the author informs us, to benefit three classes of persons,—“those who reside in great cities, those who are about to come into the great city, and those who have sent, or who are about to send children and friends to reside in the great city.” The topic is one of the first importance, and we rejoice that it has fallen into hands so competent to do it justice. The acknowledged ability of Mr. Todd as a writer, in connection with his practical knowledge of the matters of which he treats, is a sufficient voucher for the character of his volume. It contains six Lectures, the subjects of which are as follows:—Importance of having Religion in great cities, Temptations and Duties peculiar to Christians in great cities, Dangers peculiar to worldly Men engaged in business, and to Young Men in great cities. We hope it will be extensively and carefully read.

- 19.—*Old Humphrey's Observations.* New-York: Robert Carter. London: The Religious Tract Society. 1841. pp. 258.
20.—*Old Humphrey's Addresses, by the author of Old Humphrey's Observations.* Published as above. pp. 252.

These volumes are “got up” in good style by the publisher. The “Observations,” as the author says in his introduction, are the “remarks of a friendly old man, who has some affection in his heart for every human being under the canopy of the skies.” They combine the utmost familiarity and simplicity with occasional elegance of style. They are all brief, amusing and instructive, and are always, in the end, turned to some profitable account for the inculcation or enforcement of lessons of prudence, morality or religion. They are on seventy distinct subjects, the remarks on each of which are extended to two, three or four pages. The following are specimens of the topics,—the prices of things, excellent ideas, hedges and ditches, duelling, a scoffer, an aged saint's departure for glory, etc. etc.

The “Addresses” are equally miscellaneous in their character and the range of their topics; and like the “Observations,” are intended, at once to amuse and to communicate important practical, moral and religious instruction. The subjects are sixty-one in number, among which are the following,—Sanc-

tified sorrow, a comfortable home, close questioning, riches, selfishness, gin-drinking, etc. etc. On the whole we do not hesitate to recommend these as very good and useful books. They are adapted to readers of every capacity, possessing a simplicity which renders them intelligible to the least informed, and sterling sense which will command the respect of the educated and refined, in the hours of leisure and relaxation. As books for amusement, how infinitely superior to the vile and useless trash which is often resorted to for that purpose.

- 21.—*The Theory of Horticulture ; or an Attempt to explain the Principal operations of Gardening, upon Physiological Principles,—by John Lindley, Ph., D. F. R. S. Vice-Secretary of the Horticultural Society of London, and Professor of Botany in University College. First American Edition, with Notes, etc., by A. J. Downing and A. Gray. New-York: Wiley & Putnam. Boston: C. C. Little & Co. 1841. pp. 370.*

The announcement of this title-page reminds us of a certain lawyer of eminence, of whom Mr. Webster remarked, that his *statement* was an *argument*. This title, with the names of the author and editors, is sufficient to indicate the character of the work. We need only add that it enters with learning and discrimination into the principles of Horticulture, and answers in detail most of the questions which are likely to suggest themselves to the practical inquirer. It is a valuable book for the farmer as well as the gardener.

- 22.—*The Practical Spelling-Book, with Reading Lessons. By T. H. Gallaudet, and Horace Hooker. Hartford: Belknap & Hamnersley. pp. 166.*

It augurs well for the cause of education, that some of the finest intellects among us are engaged in the preparation of works for the young. To the hasty observer the making of a good spelling-book may seem a very humble employment ; but contemplated in its ultimate results, it is a most laudable because a most useful vocation. We regret that we have not room to speak of the labors of the above named gentlemen as they deserve. They have proceeded in a truly philosophical spirit, and, after much pains-taking, have constructed a spelling-book that will greatly simplify the business of primary education. We hope that all who are interested in elementary instruction will examine the work and judge for themselves.

23.—*The Jubilee Memorial ; being the Sermons, Meetings, Presentations, and a full account of the Jubilee, commemorating the Rev. William Jay's fifty years Ministry at Argyle Chapel, Bath.* New York: Robert Carter. 1841. pp. 179.

The title of this work explains its character. In the month of January last, Mr. Jay, as many of our readers are aware, completed the fiftieth year of his useful ministry at Bath. The last Sabbath of the month was observed by appropriate services ; Mr. Jay preached in the morning and Rev. Mr. East, of Birmingham, in the evening. On the Tuesday following, a meeting was held, at which £650 were presented by the congregation to their venerable pastor, and several addresses made. The sermons preached upon the Sabbath, together with a full account of the Presentation meeting, are contained in this volume. It is seldom that a jubilee of so much interest is commemorated ; and the numerous admirers of Mr. Jay in this country, we have no doubt, will read this memorial of the event with pleasure.

ARTICLE XII.

RECENT LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

Great Britain.

Part I. of Dr. Trail's new Translation of Josephus is soon to appear, containing the Life of Josephus by himself ; the principal scenes in the successive Nos. are to be illustrated by views taken by an artist who visits them for this purpose.—Mr. Fellowes' book, giving an account of his discoveries in Lycia during a second excursion to Asia Minor, is said to justify the expectations excited by the announcement of his intended revisit. It contains a description of 11 cities not upon any map, many coins hitherto unknown, a great variety of illustrations, etc.—Mr. Buckingham's "America, Historical, Statistic and Descriptive" has appeared in England. From the account given of it by the London journals, it seems to possess some of the characteristics of the Lectures on Egypt and Palestine.

Among the recent publications, we notice McKrie's Life of Knox, with numerous Additions and Corrections, and a vindication of Knox from the charge of being implicated in Rizzio's murder ; Records of Female Piety, comprising Sketches of the Lives and Extracts from the Writings of Women eminent for religious excellence, by James A. Huie ; a Church Dictionary by Dr. Hook, being Part IV. of the new series of Leeds Tracts ; the *Mécanique Céleste* of La Place, translated, with a Commentary, by Dr. Bowditch, 4 vols. 4to. ; *Logicæ Artis Com-*

pendium, by Robert Sanderson ; Hon. Mrs. Damer's Tour in Greece, Turkey, Egypt and the Holy Land ; a new and enlarged edition of Montgomery's Poetical Works. A new edition of Flügel's German Dictionary is in the press.

Germany.

The Nov. No. of the *Hall. Allg. Lit-Zeitung* contains a notice of Dr. George Christian Knapp's *Biblical Theology*. Dr. Knapp is the author of *Lectures on Christian Theology*, translated several years since by Pres. Woods. The *Biblical Theology* is published by Dr. Guerike, without alteration, from the MS. left by the author. The reviewer thinks this work will be as well received as the *Lectures on Christian Theology*.—A new quarterly periodical has been commenced at Leipsic, of which Drs. Rudelbach and Guerike are the editors. It is called : "*Zeitschrift für die gesammte lutherische Theologie und Kirche*." Each No. is to contain a running account of all the theological works which have appeared during the preceding quarter. The leading article of the first No. is on the Inspiration of the Scriptures by Rudelbach. The later opinions in Germany on this subject are reviewed. The article is unfinished.—The *History of the European States*, edited by Heeren and Ukert and published by Perthes, has already reached 34 volumes and 7 are in the press. It is intended to be a standard work.—Schelling has been appointed to an office in the department of Justice at Berlin, with liberty to give what lectures he pleases.—A professorship of modern Greek literature has been established at Berlin, and Dr. J. Franz has been appointed to fill it ; he has promised to aid in the continuation of Prof. Böckh's *Corpus Inscriptionum Græcorum*.—The small kingdom of Saxony contains 63 printing establishments ; 46 for lithographic printing, and 9 for copper-plate. Of these Leipsic alone is said to contain 39, with 120 common presses and 10 printing machines.

By the latest accounts from Germany, we learn the number of students in the several universities. At Bonn there were 594, of whom 120 were foreigners ; 87 (foreign 41) were connected with the Protestant theological department, and 89 (foreign 1) with the Catholic theological department. At Breslau there were 631 students, of whom 7 were foreigners ; 106 (foreign 1) were attending to Protestant theology, and 114 to Catholic theology. At Erlangen there were 311 students, 18 of them foreigners ; 145 were attending to theology. At Freiburg there were 301 students, 87 were foreigners ; 95 (foreign 25) were studying theology. At Giessen there were 407 students, including 76 foreigners. At Göttingen there were 704 students, 431 being foreigners ; 167 (foreign 31) were in the department of theology. At Halle there were 682 students, 144 of them were foreigners ; 420 (foreign 92) were attending to theology. At Heidelberg the number of students was 614. At Königsberg there were 390 students, 26 of them being foreigners ; 114 (foreign 5) were in the theological department. At Leipsic there were 935 students ; 276 were foreigners and 254 were studying theology. At Marburg the number of students was 285, foreigners 49 ; 67 (foreign 10) being in the theological department. At Tübingen there were 739 students, foreigners 52 ; pursuing Protestant theology 145, Catholic theology 62.

France.

The theological faculty at Montauban is arranged as follows :—M. Jalaguier is Professor of Dogmatic Theology, M. de Felice of Evangelical Morality, M. Montet, Sen. of Ecclesiastical History, M. A. Monod of Hebrew, M. Encontre of Latin and Greek Literature, M. Nicolas of Natural and Intellectual Philosophy.—Prof. Boutriche has just published his *Comparative and Historical Picture of Ancient and Modern Religions, the Principal Religious Sects and Schools of Philosophy*.—M. Firmin Didot is publishing a *Bibliothèque Grecque* in 50 large volumes. It is to contain the chefs d'œuvre of the Greek poets, historians, orators, philosophers, with Josephus and the Septuagint, with a Latin translation, and *Indices Rerum et Nominum*. Some 10 to 15 vols. have already appeared ; among them Homer's *Iliad*, *Odyssey*, *Hymns and Fragments* in 1 vol. price 12 fr. 50c., Xenophon complete in 1 vol. 15fr., Aristophanes, Menander, Philemon in 1 vol. Each vol. may be had separately.—A bill to extend the right of literary property has been rejected in the Chamber of Deputies, 158 to 108.—The *Librairie d'Education*, by Victor Boreau and L. F. Hivert, is advancing towards its completion ; the *History of France* in 2 vols., by Boreau, the *History of England*, by Boreau and Lafon, the *History of Russia*, by Duchiron, the *History of Poland*, by Cynske, the *History of Italy*, by Boreau and Duchiron ; and the *History of Germany*, by Boreau, have already appeared.

Africa.

A prospectus has been issued of a curious lithographic work, to be published in Nos. at Algiers. It is to consist of views of the Christian remains of the ancient African Church, with notes from the bishop lately appointed by the Pope for that colony. No. I. will contain a view of the ruins of the *Basilica of Peace*, at Hippona.

United States.

The Second Edition of Prof. Stuart's *N. Test. Grammar* is in the press ; most of it has been written anew ; and the remainder revised and corrected. John F. Trow has a new edition of *Edwards' Works* in the press, under the supervision of a distinguished New-England divine, based on the old Worcester edition, with additions and improvements from the English edition and other sources ; to be comprised in 4 vols. and furnished at a reduced price. D. Appleton & Co. will shortly publish *Palmer's Treatise on the Church*, edited by the Rt. Rev. Bishop Whittingham ; *Early English Church*, by the Rev. Edward Churton, edited by the Rt. Rev. Bishop Ives ; *Disce Viveri*,—*Learn to Live*, by Dr. Sutton ; *John Angel James' Widow* directed to the *Widow's God* ; also his *Happiness*,—its *Nature and Sources* ; *Lectures on Spiritual Christianity*, by Isaac Taylor, author of *Natural History of Enthusiasm* ; *Blunt's Family Commentary on Genesis* ; *Practical Christian and Devout Penitent*, by Sherlock ; *Life of Napoleon*, with 500 illustrations, 2 vols. ; *Lockhart's Spanish Ballads* ; *The Hannahs*, a continuation of the *Lady's Closet Library* ; by Robert Philip.

THE
AMERICAN
BIBLICAL REPOSITORY.

OCTOBER, 1841.

SECOND SERIES, NO. XII.—WHOLE NO. XLIV.

ARTICLE, I.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF THE GNOSTICS:—THE MANICHÆAN HERESY,
AND INFLUENCE OF GNOSTICISM ON CHRISTIANITY.

By the Rev. George B. Cheever, Pastor of the Allen-street Pres. Church, New-York.

MANES AND THE MANICHÆAN HERESY.

OUR present investigation takes up the subject just at the point where it was left in the previous article on Gnosticism by Mr. Henry T. Cheever, to which the reader may refer in the number of this journal for October, 1840.

The principal authorities consulted or followed in these pages are those of Cyril, Epiphanius, Augustine, Titus of Bostra, with the Acts of Archelaus, among the ancients, and D'Herbelot, Beausobre, Lardner, Mosheim, Brucker, Michaelis, Tenneman and some others among the moderns. The greater part of ancient Christian writers have drawn their accounts of the founder of the Manichæan heresy from one and the same source,—the book of the Acts of Archelaus, bishop of Cascar in Mesopotamia, purporting to contain an account of his conference or dispute with Manes. This book Jerome makes mention of, (*De Viris Illustribus*,) saying that Archelaus, in the reign of the Emperor Probus, composed it in Syriac, which was afterwards translated into Greek. Cyril, Epiphanius, Socrates, Photius and others either quote largely from it, or refer to it, and Socrates states expressly that he drew from it his own ac-

count of the Manichæan heresy.* It was edited at Rome, by Laurentius Zacagnius, in the year 1698, in the *Collectanea Monumentorum Veterum*, with a valuable preface. The reader may find it, with this and other illustrative prolegomena, in the fourth volume of Routh's *Reliquiæ Sacræ*. The short passage in which Eusebius mentions Manes and his heresy contains no reference to this book;—a circumstance which led Beausobre to the opinion that it had not appeared in Greek, till after Eusebius composed and published his *Ecclesiastical History*. That it is of great antiquity, and in some things worthy of credit, there can be no doubt, though falsehood mingles with it. Mosheim's opinion is as follows: *Hæc Acta . . . multa continent, aut valde probabilia aut vero consentientia.*† Beausobre argues somewhat like a special pleader, and regards the book of the Acts of Archelaus as a romance, fabricated by a Greek, who had got some materials for a memoir, and published them in the name of Archelaus, in the year 330, about sixty years after the death of Manes. Nevertheless, the epistle of Manes to Marcellus, though contained in that work, Beausobre regards as authentic, and supposes it to have been written in Greek, whence he infers that Manes understood that language.

Eusebius, in his slight notice of Manes and his heresy, is pithy and severe, or, as Lardner expresses it, (whose leaning towards the heretics is always that of kindness, a thing, we admit, under such circumstances, both just and necessary in order to be impartial,) "much out of humour." So, indeed, are all the old Christian writers; and taking their account of the scheme of Manes as at all correct, they could not well be otherwise. Cyril declares that he "blended together what was bad in every heresy, and being the lowest pit of destruction, collected the doctrines of all the heretics, and wrought out and set forth a yet more novel error."‡ The reader may get a fair view of the opinions of the early church by turning to Baronius, who, in the first volume of his *Annals*, collects from Cyril, Epiphanius, Augustine and others, a black and hideous representation of the system and its author. The sum of the opinions and feelings prevalent in regard to it may be found in a passage

* Socrates Hist. Ecc. ch. 22.

† Prolegomena to the Acts, in Routh's *Reliquiæ Sacræ*. Vol. IV. p. 134.

‡ Cyril of Jerusalem, *Catechesis*, 16, § 9.

from Pope Leo, who opposed it, compounding it out of the profaneness of Paganism, the blindness of Judaism, the deviltry of magic, and in fine, whatever is sacrilegious and blasphemous in all heresies.*

Beausobre, in his large and learned work, exhibits at great length, 1, the accounts of the Greek and Latin writers, drawn mostly, as we have seen, from the book of Archelaus, together with an investigation of their correctness; 2, the accounts of the Oriental writers, Persian, Syrian, Arabian. The first are Christian, the second Mohammedan, but all alike opposed to the Manichæans. The Mohammedans, who tolerate the Jews and Christians, not regarding them as excluded from the divine compassion, suppose that there is no grace possible for the Manichæans, and place them in hell next to the Atheists. As almost nothing has been preserved of the writings of Manes, the dogmas of the sect, and of its chief, as well as his history, have to be learned from opposers; and there is much truth in the remark of Beausobre, that the disposition of antiquity was to receive without examination all that rumor published to the disadvantage of the heretics, to exaggerate the absurdity of their opinions, and to put down as articles of their original faith, all the consequences which could result from their principles.†

The Oriental writers,—Persian, Syrian and Arabian,—differ so much from the Grecian writers, that it might be supposed that the Manes of the Greeks and he of the Orientals are two distinct heresiarchs, who, whatever resemblance there may have been in their opinions, had almost none in their history.‡ Beausobre adds to this remark, that, in comparing the Greeks and Latins with the Orientals, you know not with whom are to be found the worst reasonings or the most fabulous histories.

The name of this heresiarch has given rise to not a little curious and learned etymological conjecture. The Acts of Archelaus make Manes to have been purchased as a slave, at the age of seven years, under the name of Cubricus, by a woman who set him free and put him to his studies. Archelaus asserts farther that he took the name of Manes at the age of twelve years, on the death of his benefactress; but the more probable conjecture is that his mistress gave him that name when she

* Baronius, *Annales*, 277.

† Beausobre, *Hist. du Manich. Discours Préliminaire*.

‡ *Hist. du Manichæism*, Tom. I. pp. 155, 156.

set him free,—a thing not uncommon in the East on such occasions. The learned and sagacious Archbishop Usher having dropped a suggestion in his *Annals* on the similarity between the name of Menahem king of Israel, and that of Manes,* Beausobre has sought to confirm the conjecture, which indeed is unquestionably the right one. The name of Manes is nothing but that of Manaem, that is to say, the Paraclete, the Comforter, changed first into Manem, and thence by the Greeks, not admitting the termination *m*, into Manen or Manes.† It was very natural to suppose, (Paraclete being one of the Oriental significations of the name,) that Manes chose it because of his pretensions to be considered the Paraclete promised in the New Testament. We think it more likely that the name, acting with and upon his growing fanaticism, suggested to him the pretension, or rather confirmed him in it. He may have really persuaded himself that he had been thus marked and designated beforehand by a higher power, as the revealer of new truth, and the world's comforter that was to come.

According to the testimony of the *Chronicle of Edessa*, Manes was born in the year 239 or 240 of the Christian Era.‡ D'Herbelot§ makes him to have lived under the reigns of Sapor and Hormisdas, but to have been put to death by Varanes the son of Hormisdas, in the year 277 or 278. He is supposed by some to have been one of the Persian Magi, by others a Chaldean. He was regarded as one of the most skilful of all men in the sciences of the Persians and Babylonians. He understood the Greek language, then uncommon in the East; he

* The suggestion is thrown out by Usher in the following remark on 2 Kings 15 : 14, on the name of King Menahem.—A Sulpicio Severo, Lib. I. Hist. Pac., Manes hic appellatur; eodem quo Manes vel Manichæus hæresiarcha nomine. Utriusque vero nomen paracletum, sive consolatorem significat.—Usher, *Annales*, 47.

† Hist. du Manich. Tom. I. pp. 71, 72.—Cyril, Epiphanius and others remark upon the Greek signification of the name: "You will hate all heretics in general," says Cyril, "but especially him who takes his name from madness, *μανίας*." Cyril, *Catechesis*, VI. 12.—Titus of Bostra has the same remark:—Manichæus, qui a *barbarie* et *furore* nomen ducit. Titus Bost. Contr. Man. Bibliot. Patrum, IV. 443.

‡ Hist. du Manich. Tom. I. p. 65.

§ Bibliot. Orient. Voc. Mani.

was skilful in music, the mathematics, geography, astronomy, astrology, medicine and painting.* He believed in the spherical figure of the earth, and had himself constructed a terrestrial globe. When or how he became a Christian, we are not told; but he is said to have joined to his knowledge of the sciences an acquaintance with the Scriptures, and so great a zeal for the faith, that he was made a Christian priest at Ahvaz, a considerable city of one of the smaller Persian provinces. Here he taught and interpreted the sacred books, and disputed with the Jews, the Magi, and Pagan strangers from abroad.†

The churches of Persia‡ were in a tranquil state when Manes first broached his heresy; and there was at the head of the clergy of the East, a proud, imperious, unworthy primate, Papas by name, under whose administration a state of things had come about not unfavorable to the progress of the heretic. Under these circumstances Manes set himself up for an apostle, boasted that he had received his apostleship immediately from heaven, and alleged in proof of it, first, the perfection and plenitude of his knowledge, and second, the promise which Christ had made to the church of sending the Paraclete, the Comforter.§

Most of the Grecian writers have accused Manes of professing himself to be the Paraclete; but whether he meant that he was himself the personification of the Holy Spirit, or simply that the Holy Spirit dwelt in him, is difficult to say. Eusebius is the first writer who declares him to have pretended that he was the Paraclete.|| In the Acts of Archelaus it is said, that “as he found in the sacred books the name of Paraclete, he pretended himself to be that Paraclete.”¶ The historian Socrates declares that he called himself the Paraclete, and also named

* Hist. du Manich. Tom. I. p. 158.

† Idem, Tom. I. pp. 67, 169.

‡ Lightfoot, Vol. VII., also Vol. XII. p. 574, argues that St. Peter himself had preached in Chaldea, and that when he wrote his epistles he was in Babylon, the use of the word Bosor, in 2 Pet. 2: 15, indicating the Chaldee dialect.

§ Hist. du Manich. Tom. I. p. 186.

|| Eusebius, Hist. Ecc. ch. 31.

¶ See the whole original Acta Disputationis in Routh's Reliquiæ Sacræ, Vol. IV. Also quoted in Beausobre, Tom. I. p. 15.

himself in his epistles an Apostle of Christ.* Cyril of Jerusalem also makes the same charge.† The Epistle of Manes to Marcellus, as given by Epiphanius and others from the book of the Acts of Archelaus, commences thus: "Manes, an Apostle of Jesus Christ, and all the Saints and Virgins‡ with me, to Marcellus my dear son: Grace, mercy, and peace from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ."§ Beausobre thinks the charge made against Manes of having professed himself to be the Holy Spirit, the Paraclete, is not true, for how should he make this pretension, and at the same time call himself simply an Apostle of Jesus Christ? He brings Augustine to witness that Manes began all his letters with these words: MANES THE APOSTLE OF JESUS CHRIST.|| The assertion, however, is not made merely on the authority of the book of the Acts of Archelaus, of which Beausobre denies the authenticity, since, if Beausobre's opinion be correct, Eusebius mentions it before that book had been published; and as it is repeated by almost every writer on the subject, it seems highly probable. Mosheim is of opinion that Manes asserted himself to have been the Paraclete.¶ Titus, bishop of Bostra, a calm and apparently impartial controversialist, distinctly makes this accusation.**

A number of places may be collected from Augustine on this point, but this Father does not, that we are aware of, anywhere distinctly affirm that Manes asserted himself to be the Paraclete, but only that the Holy Ghost dwelt in him with full authority.††

The record of the blasphemous pretensions of Manes is not

* Socrates, Hist. Ecc. ch. 22.

† Cyril, Catechesis, 6, § 16.

‡ *ἅντεις ἅγιοι καὶ παρθένοι*. Tillemont supposes that these saints and virgins were disciples of Manes of both sexes; but Beausobre supposes the terms saints and virgins to refer to one and the same class, viz. men who had taken the vow of celibacy and chastity. Beausobre, Vol. I. p. 93.

§ Epiphanius, Adv. Hæres. L. II.

|| Hist. du Manich. Tom. I. ch. 2. § 10.

¶ Mosheim, Ecc. Hist. Vol. I. p. 234.

** Paracletum se appellavit, usu nominis quod non solum supra nomen, sed supra angelum est. Titus Bost. Præf. Contr. Manich. Lib. III. Bib. Patr. IV. 467.

†† Augustine, Conf. ss. L.V. 8, 9.

confined to the Greek writers. "This impostor," says D'Herbelot, "having heard say that Jesus Christ had promised to send after him a Paraclete, wished to persuade the ignorant people of Persia that himself was the Paraclete, who would announce to them from God a new religion."* Continuing the history from D'Herbelot, who omits all mention of that famous dispute with Archelaus, bishop of Mesopotamia, which figures so largely in the accounts of the earliest writers, we observe that after Manes had for some time attracted admiration by his various knowledges, he began to collect disciples, who opposed the worship and ceremonies of the Zoroastrian religion, professed hitherto by the Persians. To avoid the wrath of Sapor on this account, he fled to Turquestan, into a city or town named in Hyde and Beausobre Tchighil, where he made himself popular by adorning the temples with paintings. Here he preached his doctrine and gathered disciples. Having discovered a convenient grotto in which was a sweet fountain, he gathered provisions for a year, and in order to pass for some divinity, or more probably, if this story be true, to support his pretensions to be considered the Paraclete, told his disciples that he was going to heaven for a year, after which he should descend to earth again, and would reappear in the cave which he pointed out to them. In this retreat he perfected and arranged his scheme of philosophy and religion, and prepared a gospel for his disciples, with all the art, which as a skilful painter he was master of. At the expiration of the year they did not fail to seek him, and then he showed them that wonderful book, which he professed to have brought from heaven, bearing the name, as D'Herbelot has it, of Erzenk, or Ertenk.† It was full of wondrous images and figures, magical, astrological and prophetic, adorned and painted with such marvellous skill and beauty, that it became so celebrated in all Persia as to pass into a proverb.‡

Lardner observes that the eastern authors, quoted by Hyde and Herbelot, are not ancient but modern, being either Moham-

* Bibl. Orient. Voc. Mani.

† Ibid.

‡ Kemal Esfahani, Poète Persien, pour louer l'habilité d'un Peintre, dit "que ses ouvrages faisoient plier le Livre d'Ertenk, et mépriser toutes ses figures." Bibl. Orient. Voc. Ertenk and Erzenk.

medans or Christians of later times, and intimates that their account of the journey to heaven is taken from the history of Mohammed.* But this might equally have been imitated from the life of Zoroaster, who is said to have dwelt in a cavern, the sides of which he sculptured with mystical figures, and in that retirement may have written his book entitled the *Zend*, the Bible of the Zoroastrian Magi, which they called *the book of life*.† Khondemir, the Oriental historian quoted by D'Herbelot, asserted in reference to the pretension of Manes to be the Paraclete, that Manes *wished to apply to himself what Jesus Christ intended for Mohammed, who was to establish a new religion after him*. But it does not seem probable that Mohammedan writers would have taken passages from the life of their prophet, to deepen the interest of the Manichæan history.

While Manes was in Turquestan, the Emperor Sapor died, and Hormisdas his son reigned in his stead. Manes thereupon returned to Persia, and presented to the king the book of his revelations.‡ Hormisdas embraced the doctrines of the new prophet, and under his protection the sect increased rapidly in numbers.§ Beausobre observes that all religionists hated

* Lardner on the History of Mani, Works, Vol. III. p. 311.

† Ce mot de *Zend* signifie *vivant* ; de sorte qu'il semble que les Mages aient qualifié leur livre qu'ils estiment sacré, du titre de *Vie*, ou *Livre de Vie*. The book of *Zend* was followed by another named *Pazend*, and both together have a commentary, which goes by the name of *Abesta* or *Avesta*, ordinarily *ZENDAVESTA*. The Magi attributed it to Abraham, whom they believed to be the same with Zoroaster; and the three volumes, the *Zend*, the *Pazend* and the *Avesta*, or commentary, taken together, comprehend the whole of their religion. Their tradition is that Abraham read these books in the midst of the fiery furnace, into which Nimrod had cast him. In all probability the book of the revelations of Manes was an imitation. Bibl. Orient. Voc. *Zend* and *Abesta*.

‡ The Persians call it *Er-Tengh-Mani*, the book of the paintings of Manes. Beausobre, Tom. I. p. 190.

§ D'Herbelot observes that this emperor "gave himself to study, but his science did only injure him, inasmuch as he fell into the errors of Manes, who pretended to have refined upon the doctrine of Zoroaster, the legislator of the Magi, in mingling it with that of the Christians." This might have proved an injury to the monarch among his people, but surely not in

Manes to such a degree that the king was obliged to build him a strong castle to serve as a retreat from his persecutors. For the Christians and the Magi on the one hand pursued him as a heretic and an apostate, and the Jews and the Pagans, on the other, as the sworn enemy of their sects.* Hormisdas died in about two years, and Varanes I., his son, succeeded him. Under Varanes, who seems at first to have favored the heresiarch, a public dispute was appointed between Manes and the most learned of the Magi; a mere artifice, according to some, to draw him from his retreat into the power of his enemies. Be this as it may, the dispute was fatal to Manes, who was forthwith condemned as a heretic, and put to death in the most fearful manner.

TENETS AND DISCIPLINE OF THE MANICHÆANS.

In gathering into one view the absurdities of the scheme of Manes, we shall avail ourselves principally of the condensation by Beausobre of what he calls the whole Manichæan theology into a system, referring, however, to other authorities, and reminding our readers that Beausobre's view is more favorable than can be found in any other writer. He enumerates, in the first place, what may be called the external principles or features of Manichæism, four in number. First, the pretended authority of the heresiarch as the apostle and prophet of Jesus Christ, inspired by the Paraclete to reform all religions, and reveal to the world those truths, which the Saviour did not think proper to commit to his first disciples.† Paul himself *knew but in part, and prophesied in part*; but for Manes was reserved to destroy what is partial, and establish what is perfect.‡ In the second place, in virtue of this pretended divine mission, Manes rejected the Old Testament, as being the work of the Principle or Deity of Evil, with innumerable blasphemous

reference to any sprinkling of Christian truth which he received, unless the monstrous mixture of the Manichæan system be regarded as worse than the simple Paganism of Zoroaster. *Bibl. Orient. Voc. Hormouz.*

* *Hist. du Manich.* Tom. I. p. 201.

† *Pref. à l'Hist. du Manich.* p. 10.

‡ *Archelai et Manetis Disputatio.* 13. *Rel. Sac.* Vol. IV. 174.

objections, which are detailed in the writings of Augustine and others, and may be found in Lardner's section of the Manichæan doctrine concerning the Scriptures. He pretended to receive the New Testament,* and to argue from parts of it, but rejected what he pleased, on the ground that the Evangelists were not really the apostolic men whose names they bear, or that if they were, their books had been falsified by the Christians, who were half Jews.† In the third place, having denied the inspiration and authority of the prophets of the Old Testament, he proposed, in opposition to them, and in place of the Old Testament, other false prophets, whose books the Orientals pretended to possess. Seth, Enoch and other patriarchs, having been instructed by good angels, had transmitted to their descendants the truths thus gained. These instructions were preserved either in books, or in the schools of Oriental philosophers. All nations have their own prophets, and the Christian church, being composed of the Gentiles, ought not to listen to the Hebrew prophets, who were not intended for them. In the fourth place, the Manichæans seem to have adopted certain apocryphal books, composed in the second century to sustain the heresies of the Docetæ and the Eucratites, whose principles were similar to those of the system of Manes. His own gospel, under the appellation of Erteng, Manes set up in place of the New Testament, as a revelation direct from God.

As to the dogmas of Manichæism, its theological and philosophical hypotheses were drawn, like those of Pythagorism and Platonism, from the theology and philosophy of the East. The artifice of Manes was to baptize a system so composed, into the name and authority of the Gospel of Christ. He could not conceive of the supreme God as a holy, spiritual being, but regarded him as a living, immaterial light, residing from all eternity in the supreme heavens, and always accompanied by those pure and immortal intelligences, or emanations from the Divinity, to which he gave the name of *Æons*. The luminous substance from which heaven was formed, the residence of Deity, had the same eternity as God, but the heaven so formed, and the *Æons*,

* See also on this point, Titus of Bostra. "The Manichæans merely pretend to honor the Evangelists, in order, by that pretence, to deceive others." Titus Contr. Man. L. III. Bibl. Patrum IV. 468.

† Lardner on the Manichees, § 6.

had but a second eternity, the eternity of the world, according to Plato.*

From the essence of the Father there emanated two persons, the Son and the Holy Spirit. Since the creation of the material world, the Son resides in the sun and moon;† in the sun as power, in the moon as wisdom. The Holy Spirit resides in the air. Here they execute the orders of the Father, and here they will remain till the consummation of all things.

Manes held the Persian view of two first principles, the Light and the Darkness, and a Lord over each from eternity. One of the books of Manes is represented as commencing with this tenet: "Erat Deus et Materia, Lux et Tenebræ, Bonum et Malum, penitus sibi invicem contrariæ," etc.‡ The malignant power Manes called, in the philosophical style, matter, in the vulgar style, the demon or devil, and in the mystical style, the darkness. This malignant power would never have known the existence of the world of light, but for an insurrection in his own kingdom of darkness, in the progress of which, the troops under his command, having perceived the light, made an irruption into the kingdom of light, with intent to possess themselves of some portion of it. God opposed to them a power named *the first man*, armed with the five elements of the celestial substance. This first man being worsted in the contest, God sent a second general, *the Living Spirit*, for his assistance. Nevertheless, the powers of darkness got possession of a certain portion of the celestial substance, the light, and mingled it with the evil substance, the hyle (ὕλη) or matter.§ In order to keep possession of it, the prince of darkness formed two organized material bodies, the parents of the human race, and shut up in those bodies the portions of the celestial substance which he had plundered from the world of light. The souls, thus united to depraved matter, and involved in sensual delights, forget their celestial origin, and love their prisons, as in the Platonic scheme. It was conceived that there were two distinct souls in man, the one sensitive and concupiscent, from the prince of darkness, the

* Beausobre, Pref. 25.

† Cyril, Catech. 16. 3.

‡ Epiphanius, Adv. Hæres. L. II. 19.

§ This contest between darkness and light, and the consequent loss of the divine substance, the reader may find referred to in Augustine. Confessions, VII. 1.

other rational and immortal, from the kingdom of light. To this Augustine repeatedly refers in his writings on the Manichæan heresy. One of his works,—*De Duabus Animabus*,—was upon this subject.*

The two substances of light and darkness being thus mingled, the Living Spirit, to make the best of it, created the world for the residence of the human race thus formed by the power of evil. Out of those parts of the celestial substance which had been preserved from the contagion of matter, he formed the sun and moon. To deliver the imprisoned souls from their bondage, God, by the ministry of good angels, instructed the patriarchs, and inspired a succession of prophets and sages in all nations. At length he sent his Son to teach and deliver them, taking upon himself the appearance, but not the reality, of a body, and showing by his *mystical crucifixion*, which the Jews, instigated by the prince of darkness, accomplished, how to mortify the flesh, die to the passions, and set at liberty the soul.

Manes denied the incarnation of the Saviour, for that would have been a union with depraved matter. He denied the reality of his birth, his life, his death, his resurrection. He denied the resurrection of the flesh, because this would be to perpetuate the inherent evil of matter. He disapproved of marriage, as invented by the devil to bind souls in the flesh, and hinder their return to heaven. He recommended all sorts of austerity and maceration of the body; for the weaker it becomes, the less able it is to resist the Spirit. He divided his followers into two classes, the *elect*, or perfect ones, and the *hearers*, presenting for the first a rule of life and discipline severe and rigid in the extreme, which was somewhat relaxed for the others. The elect were to abstain not only from wine and meats, but eggs and milk, and to live upon bread, herbs and pulse, in a community of voluntary poverty, apart from all secular affairs. He permitted only the most spiritual of the pleasures of the senses, such, for

* In his Confessions, as well as in his book of heresies, Augustine speaks of those "vain talkers, who observing two wills in deliberation, affirm that there are two minds of two kinds, good and evil." L. VIII. 22. And again: "Let no man say, when he perceives two conflicting wills in the man, that the conflict is between two contrary souls, of two contrary substances, from two contrary principles, one good, and the other bad." Confess. VIII. 24. Also, De Hæres. 46.

example, as music and perfumes. His pretended aim in all this was to detach the soul from the senses, and from all terrestrial affections, because without a perfect purification it could not ascend to heaven.*

The transmigration of souls was a part of Manes' system.† He taught that they pass from one body to another for their purification; those that are not purified by a certain number of revolutions being delivered to the demons in the air to be tormented and disciplined, after which they go into other bodies, as a new school, until, having acquired sufficient purity, they traverse the region of matter, and pass into the moon. Thence they are emptied into the sun, and thence into what the Manichæans called the *column of glory*. The increase of the moon is caused by the influx of souls, or particles of celestial light ascending from the earth; it decreases by the departure of souls from the moon into the sun. The Holy Spirit, residing in the air, assists them in their purification, and the sun burns off the material particles that cling to them, and facilitates their ascension to heaven. When all souls, and all parts of the celestial substance, plundered in the first war, shall have been separated from matter, then cometh the end, the consummation. The caverns of fire will be opened, and the *Omophore*, that is, the angel who sustains and balances the world in its position, will let it fall into the flames, and will cast the whole material mass of its enclosure after it, into the place which the Scriptures call *outer darkness*. There the devils will be shut up for ever, and those lazy souls, that, by the time this catastrophe happens, shall not have finished their purification, will be set, as the punishment of their negligence, to the eternal business of keeping the devils in their dungeons, in order that they may never more attempt any thing against the kingdom of God. While the world continues, the Living Spirit keeps the demons chained in the air, and it is their rage and furious gambols that excite the tempests, thunderings, lightnings, contagious maladies and deluges of rain.‡

The worship of the Manichæans seems to have been simple

* Hist. du Manich. Pref. p. 30. Mosheim, Vol. I. p. 239.

† Idem corpora ex aliis in alia transmutari asserit, Empedoclis et Pythagoræ, Egyptiorumque opinionem manifeste secutus. Socrates, Hist. Eccles. c. 22.

‡ Beausobre, Pref.

and plain ; so much so, that they claimed to be farther removed from Paganism than all other Christians.* They observed the Lord's day ; but observed it by fasting, supposing that the world's conflagration would happen on that day, and desirous to be found in the exercise of humiliation and repentance. They had no temples, altars, images, sacrifices, burnings of incense. The following from Faustus, the Manichæan bishop, is in a higher strain than the usual tenor of the heresy.† “The heathen think that God is to be worshipped with altars, victims, chapels, images, incense. I, if I might be worthy, would esteem myself a reasonable temple of God. Christ his Son, I receive as a living image of the living God. His altar is my mind, cultivated with care, and endowed with knowledge and just sentiments. The honors and sacrifices, which I present to the Deity, are prayers, and those pure and simple.” Nevertheless, Socrates accuses them of worshipping the sun, and Augustine makes the same accusation.‡ To the same purpose is the evidence of a passage in Cyril, who had among his own hearers some converts from the Manichæan heresy.§ The Manichæans observed the anniversary of the death of Manes with great solemnity, but the memorial of Christ's death with but little devotion.|| They practised, in some measure, the ordinance of baptism. Baronius quotes Jerome blaming Hilarius as a schismatic, because he received those baptized by the Manichæans without any other baptism.¶

On the whole, the account of the system of this heresiarch may not unfairly, though severely, be summed up in the words of the learned Cave. *Dogmata quæ spargebat Manes, partim ex fœculentissimis hæresiarcharum lacunis, partim ex ineptissimis orientalium nugis, partim ex absurdis gentilium philosophorum placitis, partim denique ex ipsius Christianæ religionis*

* Mosheim and Schlegel in Annot. I. p. 239.

† Lardner, III. p. 384.

‡ Valesius in Socrates quotes a letter from Libanius to Priscian in Palestine, that they worship the sun,—are found in many places,—but everywhere few. Vales. in Soc. I. c. 22.

§ Cyril, Catechesis, 16, § 3. “Here let converts from the Manichæans gain instruction, and no longer make these lights their gods, nor impiously think that the sun, which shall be darkened, is Christ.”

|| Mosheim, Beausobre, and Lardner.

¶ Baronius, Annales, 277, 687.

*institutis partita sunt.** One of the strangest things connected with this perverse and prodigious mixture of heathenism and Christianity is this, that it was not attended and followed with some equally perverse form of practical immorality; but from this charge, though there have been some monstrous things alleged of the practices of the Manichæans, its historians have remarkably abstained. There is reason to believe, that, in actual manners or morals, the sect of the followers of Manes were among the purest of the ancient errorists. Such was their profession, and some strong and ardent minds were allured by it.† Manes himself may have been not wholly an impostor, perhaps not more so than Ammonius, Plotinus, or Jamblichus. His pretensions to divine visions and authority the two latter speculators share with him. A philosophical and ardent genius having led him astray in the mazes of Oriental speculation, he determined to accommodate Christianity to the Oriental philosophy, and baptize that philosophy with the semblance of Christianity. When he had finished his scheme, it was in opposition at once to Jews, Christians and Pagans.

With all its monstrous absurdities, the consideration of this, as of every Gnostic heresy,‡ is of great interest and importance in ecclesiastical history. Not that the followers of Manes were many,—some in many places, but everywhere few, according to Libanius,—but his system was the personification of an existing spirit and tendency necessary to be studied, and in its delineation forming an essential part of the history of Gnosticism. It is true that it derives no small degree of importance from the character and writings of its opponents, Augustine in particular, in whose personal experience, as well as his controversial works, we have a practical exhibition of the nature of its influence. The system itself, as well as such an exhibition of it, is interesting and instructive, were it only to show the darkness and vain struggles of the mind apart from divine truth.

* *Cave. Voc. Manes. An. 277, p. 90.*

† To this purpose Augustine: "Alypius was involved in the same superstition with me, loving in the Manichæans that show of continency which he supposed true and unfeigned." *August. Confess. VI. 12.*

‡ It was certainly of the Gnostic family. "Among the Manichæans our credulity was mocked by a promise of *certain knowledge*, and then so many most fabulous things were imposed to be believed," etc. *August. Confess. c. 6, 7.*

And every form of the Gnostic heresies is curious for its manifestation of the nature of that monstrous incubus, which the spirit of Pagan philosophy, so far as it prevailed, laid upon the mind of the world's early Christianity.

It is astonishing to see how destitute men's minds were, in that age, of any true spiritual conceptions, and how difficult it was to admit and entertain such conceptions. "And because," says Augustine of his own experience in the darkness of the Manichæan error, "when I wished to think on my God, I knew not what to think of but a mass of bodies, for what was not such did not seem to me to be any thing; this was the greatest and almost only cause of my inevitable error. For hence I believed evil also to be some such kind of substance. And because a piety, such as it was, constrained me to believe that the good God never created any evil nature, I conceived two masses contrary one to another, both unbounded, but the evil narrower, the good more expansive. I could not conceive of mind, unless as a subtile body, and that diffused in definite spaces. Though not under the form of the human body, yet was I constrained to conceive of thee as being in space, whether infused into the world, or diffused infinitely without it."* These passages serve to show with what despotic power the grasp of materialism had laid hold of Augustine's mind. At that time he really thought that the whole church entertained no other belief, and it was only by reading some of the writings of Plato translated into Latin, (possibly, as Milnor suggests, with some scriptural addition,) that he began first to gain any glimpse of the immateriality of the divine nature.

There were three grand difficulties in men's philosophical speculations. First, they could not form the idea of a pure spirit. Secondly, they could not admit that any thing could be created out of nothing.† The act of creation itself, by the Omnipotent, they seemed to think, needed some sort of material for its foundation. Or, if the act of creative power were exerted upon nothing apart from God, *ab extra*, the creation was drawn, in some sense, out of the divine substance, it was a part of God. Hence Pantheism, and the ancient Pythagorism, essentially the same with the Spinozism of modern times. "*From nothing nothing proceeds,*" "*from nothing nothing can be made,*" were maxims which passed for an equal, universal verity. The

* Aug. Conf. V. 19 and 20. Also VII. 1. Also V. 7.

† Hist du Manich. Tom. II. p. 163.

conception of absolute creation, like that of absolute annihilation, no Pagan philosopher ever entertained or suggested.* Thirdly, they were haunted by the belief of the inherent viciousness of matter. This sentiment is indeed the grand foundation of Gnosticism. That matter is the cause of evil was the general opinion of philosophers, whether Jewish, Pagan or Christian.† Now this proposition being admitted, men must either deny that God created matter, or say that God is the cause of evil. For the author of the cause is the author of the effect; and freedom never having been supposed an attribute of matter, if matter be the cause of evil, it is the necessary cause; so that, if God created matter out of nothing, he would be the first cause of evil, since he gave existence to a substance which is the necessary cause of it. "See here," remarks Beausobre, "the meshes, in which not only Manes but all ancient philosophers found themselves entangled, not being able to break them but by denying a proposition universally avowed, viz., that matter is the necessary cause of evil." Now if, as we have seen, a mind like Augustine's was long pressed by these difficulties, even after some acquaintance with Christianity, we may readily acknowledge the power of them in the formation of the schemes of the Gnostic heretics. It may be indeed that they were glad of so honorable a pretence for broaching their wild schemes. Nevertheless, the question *Unde Malum* was a great and real perplexity. *Fugiens fumum in ignem incidit*, one of the Fathers remarks of Manes; and the same is true of his Gnostic precursors. To avoid one difficulty they broached ten thousand absurdities.

ANTIQUITY OF THE SOURCES OF GNOSTICISM.

It was the power of this belief in the inherent malignity of matter, that gained for the Gnostic philosophy so much tolerance in the churches, making adherents to its schemes even

* Burnet goes so far as to declare that "creation and annihilation, in the sense which we attach to them, are new words, neither Hebrews, Greeks, nor Latins having had any terms to express those ideas. The opinion that matter was made out of nothing would appear to be a dogma wholly unknown to the nations and the philosophers." Burnet, *Archæology* quoted by Beausobre.

† Hist. du Manich. Tom. II. p. 268.

when they were branded as heresies. According to the maxim that every grand error must have had some phase or mixture of truth to recommend it, this was one commendatory ingredient in Gnosticism,—its professed satisfactory disposition of the *quæstio vexata* as to the origin of evil; this was its bright, alluring side, no matter through what profane and old wives' fables and endless genealogies of Valentinians or Manichæans the mind was led wandering. To measure and account for its power over Christianity, it is necessary to remount to its sources, and to know how long it had been gathering consistency and an admitted place in men's opinions. For it was not the exhalation of a day, but the accumulation of centuries; it was an element and an influence that had long pervaded the world's mind, in various directions, taking shape and becoming visible. We have already referred to the opinions of Vitringa,* Buddæus† and others, as to some of the original fountains of this philosophy. These learned men regard the Gnosticism of antiquity as in part the product of Jewish Christians, imbued with the dogmas of the Cabbalists; and the Gnostic theology as altogether the same with the Pythagorean and Platonic philosophy, as illustrated by the Cabbalists. In the use of the word *genealogies* they think Paul meant to designate the *Æons* of the Gnostics, or, what is the same thing, the *Sephiroth* of the Cabbalists; the argument both of the Gnostic and the Cabbalistic theology being one and the same,—the origin and gradations of things, and the first cause and origin of evil. The learned Grotius is of the same opinion.‡

The origin of the Cabbalistic system is placed by some no earlier than the first centuries of the Christian era, but if then already systematized, it must have been gathering for a long previous period. Tenneman characterizes the whole “as a mass of strange and exaggerated fictions, conceived under the influence of the religion of the Persians, but employed by those who advanced them to recommend to general notice the sacred history and doctrines of the Jews; especially with respect to

* Vitringa, Diss. Sec. de Sephiroth Kabbalistarum § I. c. 2.—Also, De Hæresibus Natis in Eccl. Apost. § IV. c. 9.

† Buddæus, Dissertatio de Hæresi Valentin. § 15.

‡ Grotius jam monuit, et nihil eo certius quam Theologiam Gnosticorum omnino fuisse eandem cum Philosophia Pythagorica aut Platonica, ut a Kabbalistis est illustrata. Kabbala

the creation, and the origin of evil.”* The Jews during their exile gathered from the religion and philosophy of Zoroaster some of the same materials which afterwards, in combination with certain features of Christianity, appeared in the schemes of the Gnostics; the Primitive Light, the Two Principles, the Good and the Evil, and the Demons.† The resemblance between the Essenes and the Pythagoreans (taking for truth the account of Pythagoras’s sojourn in the East) may have had the same Oriental origin.‡ From the time of the Babylonish captivity, but more especially from the period of the Alexandrian colony of Jews in Egypt, the Pagan philosophy,—both the Oriental and afterward the Grecian,—became known, and the result was a mixture of Platonic, Pythagoric, Egyptian and Oriental doctrines with the ancient faith of the Jews in their explanations of the law and the traditions. So the progress of things is traced by Brucker. This eminently learned and critical historian has exhibited at great length the formation and influence of the Pythagorico-Egyptiaco-Platonic-Oriental theology, considering it as the source both of the Jewish *arcana*, and of the Christian heresies. The practice, which prevailed in the schools of Alexandria, of clothing the doctrines of philosophy in an allegorical dress being introduced among the Jews, the Pythagorico-Platonic philosophy by degrees became familiar in the nation. The Gentile philosophy which the Jews adopted, they, like the Christian Fathers, attributed originally to their own native fountains of inspiration, and with this belief, under the cover of allegory, learned men could introduce whatever they pleased as a legitimate inference from their own sacred books. Of the philosophy so constructed,

recentior Judæorum, ut jam circa ætatem Pauli exulta est, agit potissimum de *rerum originatione et gradationibus*; sive de modo productionis aut profluxus rerum a primo ente et earundem rerum gradibus et descensu a summis ad una; at nuper vir quidem eruditus observavit. Quod idem esse Gnosticæ Theologiæ argumentum, neminem doctorum latet. Quantum has res respexi, tam Gnostici quam Kabbalistæ, circa duo potissimum fuerunt occupati. 1. Ut explicarent, quo ordine et serie res omnes sint ex Deo *tanquam ente necessario existente*. 2. Ut declararent *causam et originem primam mali*.—Vitr. Diss. Sec.

* Tenneman, *Manual Hist. Phil.* 198. † Ibid. 196.

‡ Walchius, *De Phil. Orient. Gnost. Syst. Fonte*.

mingled with dogmas from the Oriental philosophy, the Jew Philo was a follower and teacher. The Cabbalistic philosophy was gathered into a system under the same influence.* Brucker has drawn up a minute and laborious parallelism, under twenty-two points, of the dogmas received in the Alexandrian, Oriental and Cabbalistic philosophy, showing beyond controversy that they all have the same origin.† He thinks that in the apocryphal book of the Wisdom of Solomon, there are indications, beyond all contradiction, of the mingling of the Grecian and Egyptian philosophies; and he refers to the 17th verse of the 7th chapter especially, as containing a brief *adumbration* of the whole encyclopedia of the Alexandrian philosophy of that day.‡ Nor can it be doubted that the author of this book was a man of Grecian erudition, drawing both from the Pythagorico-Platonic school already adulterated by a mixture of Oriental dogmas, and also from the dreams of the Cabbalists themselves.§

An examination of the Valentinian and other Gnostic heresies shows the same complicated derivation for the whole of them; that of Manes, more than the rest, being avowedly Oriental. A strong additional argument is preferred from certain fragments of Theodotus, which the reader may find annexed to the works of Clemens Alexandrinus, exhibiting the Valentinian and Gnostic explanations of Scripture, and bearing the title of “*Epitomæ* of the writings of Theodotus, καὶ τῆς ἀνατολικῆς καλουμένης διδασκαλίας, and of the doctrine called the Oriental in the time of Valentinian.”|| This witness seems at once to vindicate the assumption of the existence of a system

* Brucker, Hist. Crit. Phil. Tom. II. 832. Ejus contaminatæ philosophiæ Judaicæ origines in Ægypto fuisse enatas et cum allegorica methodo philosophemata Ægyptiaca, Orientalia et Pythagorico-Platonica introduxisse inter Judæos—demonstravimus.

† Tom. II. 958—968.

‡ Tom. II. 695. Habes hic, lector, et voces ex intima philosophia Græcanica maxime Platonica, desumtas, et encyclopædiæ, qualis eo tempore Alexandriæ obtinet, brevem adumbrationem, et dogmata Græcanica, consistere sapientiam in earum rerum notitia, quæ tum summo in Platoniorum scholis loco habebantur.

§ Idem, 697.

|| Tom. III. 297.

of Oriental philosophy at that early period, and the reference of the schemes of the Gnostics to that system as their grand fountain. The earliest Jewish knowledge of this system takes us back to the Babylonish captivity, and thence we remount to the philosophy of Zoroaster, and even of Oriental sects before his appearance. The Cabbalistic product, from such a filtration of philosophic mud as we have been tracing, is so simply, and with just severity, delineated by Brucker in the expression of his own opinion, that we shall give it in his own words. *Scripta Cabbalistica antiquiora, qualia sunt Soharica, Jezirah, Bahir, et similia, tant caligine densaque nocte repleta, tantaque confusione scripta esse, ut æque facile sit, album et nigrum, quadrata et rotunda, ex illis exsculpere, et eadem verisimilitudine dogmata sibi e diametro adversa effingere.**

Briefly summed up by Enfield in his abridgment of Brucker, the argument stands thus: "When the sects of the Essenes and the Therapeutæ were formed in Egypt, foreign tenets and institutions were borrowed from the Egyptians and Greeks, and, in the form of allegorical interpretations of the law, were admitted into the Jewish mysteries. These innovations chiefly consisted in certain dogmas concerning God and divine things, at this time received in the Egyptian schools, particularly at Alexandria, where the Platonic and Pythagorean doctrines, on these subjects, had undergone a material alteration, by being mixed with the Oriental philosophy. For the Alexandrian Platonists, having rejected the Dualistic system, had now, from the Orientalists, adopted the Emanative, and admitted the doctrine of various orders of divine emanations. This doctrine, which, by the help of allegory, was easily accommodated to the sacred writings, was embraced, under the notion of traditionary mystery, by Aristobulus and other founders of the sect of the Therapeutæ, and admitted into their writings, as may be seen from the works of Philo. The Jewish mysteries, thus enlarged by the accession of Pagan dogmas, were conveyed from Egypt to Palestine at the time when the Pharisees, who had been driven into Egypt under Hyrcanus, returned, and with them many other Jews, into their own country. From this time the Cabbalistic mysteries continued to be taught in the Jewish schools."†

* *Historia Critica Philosophiæ*, Tom. II. p. 1058.

† Abridgment of Brucker by Enfield, Book IV. Ch. 3.

Mosheim's definition of the appellation of the Gnostics reads thus:* "Under the appellation of Gnostics are included all those in the first ages of the church, who modified the religion of Christ by joining with it the Oriental philosophy, in regard to the source of evil, and the origin of this material universe." This definition is based upon the supposition that all the Gnostic sects derived their tenets from the Oriental philosophy. And C. G. Walch remarks, that neither Greeks, Carthaginians nor Romans ever originated any of the Gnostics, although Greeks, Carthaginians and Romans, when they joined the Christian party, were wont to bring with them into their Christian tenets, the particular opinions of whatever school in philosophy they had affected to cultivate. In corroboration of Mosheim's opinion, this learned writer observes as remarkable, that all the branches of the whole family of Gnostic heresies should have been born either in Egypt, Syria or Persia, or at least were founded and formed by those who lived or were educated in those regions. Basilides, Carpocrates and Valentinus originated in Egypt, Manes in Persia, Cerinthus in Judea, Bardesanes and others in Syria. And however these heretics differed among themselves, they all held certain common and universal opinions, of which the elements are plainly discoverable in the Oriental philosophy. The question at the foundation of Gnosticism was the origin of evil. Whether the same question was agitated out of Judea among the people of the East, we have no *certain* historical testimony, but it is enough that hypotheses were adopted which served to solve it.†

There was the opinion of the two principles. There is a great difference between the hypothesis of matter in equality with the Supreme Deity from eternity, in order to avoid the supposition that the world was made out of nothing, and that of two principles, supposed in order to avoid making the Supreme Deity the author of evil. The Persians, the Chaldeans, the Egyptians all held to one fountain of good, another of evil. Walchius refers to Hyde, Stanley, Buddæus, Brucker and Jablonskius. Then came the doctrine of Æons or Emanations, who built the world, as a sort of mixture of the two opinions of one fountain of all things, and of the Dualistic theory. That another

* Mosheim, Cent. I. Part II. c. 5.

† Walchius, De Phil. Orient. Gnost. Syst. Fonte. Appended to a volume of Michaelis' Syntagma, pp. 287—293.

being, different from God, built the universe, and that the spirits called *Æons* were substances emanating from God, were opinions prevailing in the East before the appearance of the Gnostics. That the world was built by God none believed without divine revelation. From the doctrine concerning the *Æons* arose the opinions concerning spirits presiding over stars and bodies, and innumerable Jewish fables of angels, and likewise the study and practice of magic. Then as to the bodily discipline and manners of the Gnostics and oriental philosophers, they arose in both cases from the same belief in the evil of matter, and manifested the same by corporeal mortifications and ascetic severity of life.

All these points of opinion between the Gnostic and the Oriental philosophy are enumerated by Walchius in a very admirable dissertation concerning the origin of the Gnostic system, affixed to the *Syntagma Commentationum* of Michaelis. Nevertheless the writer somewhat distrusts, for want of written documents, the conclusions of Mosheim and Brucker as to the existence of an Oriental *system* already formed, from which the Gnostics drew as from a fountain. Michaelis, on the other hand, thinks that there is no good ground for denying the actual existence of the Gnostic system before the Christian system, merely because there are no books previous in which it is found recorded.* He undertakes to supply the one link which is wanting in the argument, and to trace the Gnostic philosophy as early at least as the time of the Septuagint and the writings of Philo. His method is curious and ingenious. He states, as a prominent error of the Gnostic philosophy, the notion that the God of the Jews, who is said to have built the world, and who was called the Demiurge, was not the Supreme God, but a being ignorant of the future, continually in danger of mistakes, and agitated by repentance, envy and anger.† Now the interpreters of the Pentateuch, finding in Genesis some ground or seeming occasion for such an error, determined in their transla-

* Michaelis, *Gnostici ante Christianos*. § 1. Nec quod in libris ante Christianismi initia scriptis certa non apparent gnosticorum errorum vestigia, ideo erratum fuisse recte neges. Non damnanda ergo aut repudianda Moshemiorum similiumque de Gnosticis ante Gnosticos Christianos opinio, sed veri potius simillima ac prope certa ducenda.

† Michaelis, *Diss. de Indiicis Gnost. Phil.* § 2.

tion to leave no possibility for such an accusation against the God of the Scriptures. Into this passage in Gen. 6 : 6, instead of the idea of repentance, they have introduced that of deliberation, rendering the Hebrew, וַיִּחְשַׁב by the Greek verb ἐνθυμέω ; καὶ ἐνεθυμήθη ὁ θεός, *et deliberavit Deus*.* They have also wholly omitted translating the Hebrew phrase *and it grieved him at his heart*.† Michaelis argues, that the Greek translators would not have resorted to this forced interpretation and method of dealing with the passage in question, had there not already existed in Egypt those, who denied that the God of the Hebrews and Creator of the World was the Supreme Being, accusing him of mistakes, repentance and other like affections. In the same manner they managed the seventh verse, and Michaelis quotes Philo at a later period, arguing against his adversaries with the same labored explanation. The third Clementine homily, containing the dialogue between Peter and Simon Magus, is also adduced, showing the Gnostic heretics, after the Christian era and the application of the term Gnostic, using the same passage in Genesis, even in the Greek translation, as a *locus classicus* in defence of the irposition in regard to the Demiurge.‡ In Exodus 32 : 12, 14, the idea of repentance is again, by a similar circumlocution, avoided in the Septuagint.§ The argument of Michaelis, if it does not go the length of supplying the want of documentary evidence, adds at least to the probability of the existence of Gnosticism a century or more before it became manifested and organized in profession and name.

It had then, we may safely assume, something of the power of a long established and accumulating influence, when it first, however covertly, made its way into the Church of Christ. Several philosophic tendencies, long prevalent, seem to have come to a point and been manifested in something like a system about the commencement of the Christian era.

As the mixture of Platonic, Oriental and Jewish doctrines, entitled Neoplatonism, appears in Philo the Jew, so the engrafting of Oriental principles, learned by the Jews in Egypt, upon the Jewish mysteries, entitled the Cabbalistic system, appears in some of the Gnostics. For although the Eclectic

* Michaelis, Diss. de Indiciis Gnost. Phil. § 2.

† Idem, § 7 and 8.

§ Idem, § 5.

‡ Idem, § 6.

school of philosophy was not established as a school till the time of Ammonius Saccas,* in the latter part of the second century, yet the method of Eclecticism was in vogue before the coming of Christ.† The Gnostics were in fact bold and imaginative Eclectics, some of them of the wildest class, simply and merely adopting Christianity as a part and parcel in the incongruous mixture of their materials. Some drew from the Oriental philosophy through the channel of the Cabbala, others through the Pythagorean scheme, or directly from original Oriental sources. In the first and second centuries, besides Simon Magus, there were Menander the Samaritan, and Cerinthus, probably a Jew,‡ and the Egyptians Basilides and Valentinus, in all likelihood familiar with the Cabbalistic philosophy and choosing to modify their Oriental principles in conjunction with it. They held to the Emanative scheme, and but one Principle of all things. Bardesanes, the Syrian, and afterwards Manes, the Persian, adopted the Oriental Dualistic scheme more entirely. But they were all followers or formers of that monstrous system of Egyptian Eclecticism, which, along with some things from all systems of philosophy at all in vogue, combined or professed to combine also the tenets of Christianity itself.

The stream of philosophy, down to its mixture with Christianity, would seem then to have proceeded thus,—Oriental, Alexandrian, Cabbalistic, Gnostic. In the Alexandrian there meet and mingle, first, the tides of the Oriental and the Grecian; in the Cabbalistic, the Oriental, Grecian and Jewish flow on together; and in the Gnostic philosophy an Eclecticism of all that preceded pours itself into the pure stream of Christianity, almost at its first beginnings. It is a matter of no little acuteness and difficulty to analyze and trace to their true origin these different elements. Some learned writers have thought it sufficient to trace the Jewish Cabbala to the Grecian Mythology, and the whole Gnostic theology to the same source.§ Picus, Earl of

* Tenneman, § 202.—Mosheim, Cent. I. Part II. ch. 5.

† *Certiora et notiora eclecticæ sectæ fundamenta jecit Ammonius.* Brucker, *Hist. Crit.* Tom. II. 205.

‡ C. G. F. Walch, *De Gnost. etc. ut supra.* *Cerinthi origines subobscuræ sunt, Judeum tamen eum fuisse recte ex eo colligitur, quod contra communem Gnosticorum morem, Mosis justum tribuit honorem.*

§ Gale, *Court of the Gentiles*, B. II. ch. 1.

Mirandula, a well known prodigy of learning, referred the origin of the Cabbalistic system to Moses, solemnly declaring that in the Cabbalistic books, which he purchased at great expense, and studied with incredible labor, he found well nigh the whole Christian system.* He was followed in the same blind enthusiasm by Reuchlin; and in England the learned Henry More was distinguished by the same veneration for the Cabbala. Gale argues that "the Cabbalistic symbolic explication of Scripture found no place in the Judaic theology, till the Pythagorean and Platonic philosophy was incorporated therewith;"† and he quotes the learned Mirandula granting that hypothesis, by acknowledging the affinity of the Jewish Cabbala to the Pythagorean and Platonic philosophy. Of the mixture of that philosophy with any tenets from the East there was either an entire ignorance, or it was not deemed necessary to refer to it. To the same purpose of a Pagan origin of the Gnostic heresies argues Bishop Stillingfleet, in his *Origines Sacræ*.‡

Brucker attributes the opinion of the Fathers on this point to their ignorance of Orientalism.§ They never seem to have gone beyond the Grecian philosophy in tracing the origin of heresies. When Tertullian tells us that the heresies of the Gnostics are suborned by philosophy, he has nothing else in view.|| He

* Brucker, Tom. II. p. 918, etc.

† Gale, p. 118.

‡ "From these things (the fables of the Phœnician theology) as foolish and ridiculous as they are, it is very probable the Gnostics and the several subdivisions of them might take the rise of their several Æones and *συζυγίαι*: for here we find *Αἰὼν* and *Πρωτόγονος* made two of the number of the gods." Stillingfleet, *Origines Sacræ*, B. I. ch. 2. § 7.

§ Hist. Crit. Tom. III. p. 287. *Solius Græcanicæ philosophiæ periti nec Orientalem intellerunt.*

|| Tertull. De Præs. Adv. Hær. The whole passage is worth quoting. "Hæ sunt doctrinæ hominum et dæmoniorum, prurientibus auribus natæ de ingenio sapientiæ secularis, quam dominus stultitiam vocans stulta mundi in confusionem etiam philosophiæ ipsius elegit. Ea est enim materia sapientiæ secularis temeraria interpret divinæ naturæ et dispositionis. Ipsæ denique hæreses a philosophia subornantur. Inde æones et formæ nescio quæ, et trinitas hominis apud Valentinum: Platonius fuerat. Inde Marcionis deus melior de tranquillitate; a Stoicis venerat: et uti anima interire dicatur, Epicurus ob-

enumerates Plato, the Stoics, Epicurus, Zeno, Heraclitus, and gives, as the whole material of heresy and philosophy, the questions *Unde malum et quare?* and *Unde homo et quomodo?* It would not, however, be necessary to go any further than the Greek philosophy itself, to find all the seeds of things supposed to have sprung from the Oriental philosophy. In the time of the Asmoneans, or Maccabees, there was a decree made among the Jews *that whosoever taught his son the Grecian philosophy should be accursed.* This decree points, perhaps, to the commencement of that disposition in the Jewish theology to symbolize and allegorize after the manner of Plato and Pythagoras, which afterwards becomes so manifest in the writings of Philo. And as to the origin of the Gnostic Æons, says a very learned writer, in whom it may be seen that the hypothesis of an Oriental philosophy is by no means *necessary* to account for any of the vagaries of heretics or the corruptions of Christianity,—“they were taken up in imitation of the Grecian *θεογονία*, *generation of the gods*, begun by Sanconiathon, the Phœnician mythologist, who was followed herein by Orpheus, Hesiod and Pherecydes, who was of Phœnician extract, and spent a main part of his philosophizings in explaining this *θεογονία*; from whom we may presume Pythagoras, his scholar, learned the same, as also from the Orphic theologists, with whom he much conversed. Now the Gnostics apply the whole of this Pagan *θεογονία*, to their *ἄιῶνες*, Æons.”* To these same points Irenæus and Eusebius are quoted, without resorting to the Emanative system of the East.

Now it is literally true that whatever tenets we find in the Greek philosophy lead us, in the end, if we trace them out, to

servatur. Et ut carnis restitutio negetur, de una omnium philosophorum schola sumitur. Et ubi materia cum deo æquatur, Zenonis disciplina est: et ubi aliquid de igneo deo allegatur, Heraclitus intervenit. Eædem materiæ apud hereticos et philosophos volutantur, eædem retractatus implicantur. Unde malum et quare; et Unde homo et quomodo? Et quod proxime Valentinas proposuit, Unde Deus? . . . Hinc illæ fabulæ et genealogiæ indeterminabiles, et quæstiones infructuosæ, et sermones serpentes velut cancer, a quibus nos apostolus refrænans, nominatim philosophiam testatur caveri oportere.

* Theoph. Gale, *Court of the Gentiles*, Part III. B. II. ch. 1.

the Oriental world; and the question of the origin of Gnosticism is not really whether it was Grecian or Oriental, but whether its Oriental origin dated in more ancient or more recent times. "You Greeks are children, and know nothing of antiquity," said the Egyptian priests to Plato; and true it is that the progress of light and knowledge was wholly from east to west; and whatever is traced to the Greeks comes at last to the Orientals.* So that, in fact, the question being simply as to the earlier or later Oriental sources of this particular scheme, one of the strongest arguments, which connects Gnosticism immediately with the Oriental philosophy, and shows its parentage, is the after prevalence of the belief in the inherent viciousness of matter. This quality is not Greek but Oriental; and this quality, this pervading feeling, the inundation of Gnostic opinions, even when it had retired, left a sort of philosophic mud upon the churches, prolific of luxuriant monstrosities, generating a growth, not of fruits and vegetables, but of rank and poisonous weeds.

In the New Testament the allusions or references to this subject, whether plain or obscure, travel no farther than to the Jews or Greeks. Paul, educated at the feet of Gamaliel, probably was well aware of the system which the Cabbalists were gathering, and of its destructive influence upon the truth; but though he refers to it†, in terms of severe reprobation, he gives no hint of its Oriental origin. Bringing together a few of his expressions, we find them to characterize so closely the traits of the Gnostic philosophy, as it afterwards grew into systems, that it is impossible not to concur in the opinions of Vitringa, Brucker, Grotius, Hammond and others, who suppose the workings of that philosophy in the churches plainly alluded to. It is noticeable that most of these allusions are found in the Epistles to Timothy and Titus, with some also in the Epistle to the

* "It is well known that the most ancient and mystic learning among the Greeks was not originally their own, but borrowed of the more eastern nations by Orpheus, Pythagoras, Plato, and many more, who travelled and traded with the priests for knowledge and philosophy." Burnet, *Theory of the Earth*, Vol. I. 19.

† Tit. 1: 14, *Ἰουδαϊκοῖς μύθοις*.

Colossians. *Ἡ γνώσις φουσιῶι, knowledge puffeth up,* was the comprehensive characteristic of that φιλοσοφίας καὶ κενῆς ἀπάτης, *philosophy and vain deceit after the traditions of men,** the work of men, *vainly puffed up by their fleshly mind, and not holding the Head.†* Μύθοις καὶ γενεαλογίαις ἀπεράντοις, *fables and endless genealogies,‡* —profane and old wives' fables,§—profane and vain babblings, and ἀντιθέσεις τῆς ψευδωνύμου γνώσεως, *oppositions of science falsely so called,||* the tendency of which was settled, *to increase unto more ungodliness,* and which should become γάγγραινα, *the gangrene of the church, their word eating as doth a canker.¶*

It was a skilful pencil that drew these touches, mingled from the colors both of past and prophetic experience; no man can have the least knowledge of the vain and cankerous babblings of the Gnostics, and not be at once convinced of the intended application of these sketches, and filled with admiration of their accuracy. We need only add to this glance at the references in the New Testament, that Irenæus and Jerome both assert that John's design in his gospel was to contend against the errors of Cerinthus, the Gnostic, an opinion followed by some learned moderns, though rejected by others, admitting at the same time that there are expressions in John's Gospel which may be used against the Gnostics.** Now we think there can be scarcely any more doubt that John, in the repeated description of the creation of the world by the Logos, had in view the monstrous cosmogonies afterwards put forth systematically by the Gnostics, and the profane opinion of the world built by the Demiurge or the Æons, than that in his epistles he had in view the Gnostic heretics who denied that Jesus Christ had come in the flesh.†† Nor is it necessary in this to suppose that Gnosticism fresh from the Oriental philosophy had already appeared, (as afterwards in the Manichæan heresy,) for there were seeds and influences of it in abundance in the then prevailing corrup-

* Col. 2: 8.

† Col. 2: 18, 19.

‡ 1. Tim. 1: 4.

§ 1. Tim. 4: 7.

|| 1. Tim. 6: 20.

¶ 2. Tim. 2: 19, 17.

** Tholuck. Introd. to Comment. on John.

†† See some judicious remarks in Wiseman's Lectures, Lecture eleventh. See also Milman's History of Christianity, B. II. Ch. 5.

tions of Judaism, with which both John and Paul were doubtless acquainted.*

Whichever way we trace it, the spirit of Gnosticism was no new thing, whether from the corruptions of Judaism, or the wilderness of Oriental speculations, it passed into the Christian church. The heresy created by it arose beneath the prescriptive and long existing influence of philosophy, and with the pretence of being the most perfect of all philosophic systems, the climax of perfection in the art of eclecticism. And it found almost every person inclined to philosophize, and proud, if it could be attained, of a philosophic reputation. It found the world deluged with philosophy. This is a point of great importance in attempting to account for its influence.

CAUSES OF THE SPREAD AND POWER OF GNOSTICISM.

Perhaps there never was a period in the world's history when there prevailed such an extraordinary enthusiasm, such a rage, or madness, we might call it, in the pursuit of philosophy. And everywhere it was philosophy falsely so called. There never was a period in which so many different sects were contending together on one and the same arena. The world was

* Lightfoot, *On the Fall of Jerusalem and Condition of the Jews after*; Works, Vol. III. 403. "As the first wretched stock of heretics that rose, Simon, Cerinthus, Menander, Ebion, Basilides, &c., appeared either in Judea, or at least where there were multitudes of Jews, as Basilides at Alexandria; so the most of those damnable opinions that they sowed, and which grew for a long while after, had some root or other in Judaism, or received some cursed moisture from thence to nourish them. By Judaism I here understand the body of the Jews' religions, though differing within itself, yet all contrary to Christianity. Look upon Palestine, and you have it thus stocked, in the times that we are upon, with Pharisees of seven sorts, with Sadducees at the least of two sorts, if not more, with Samaritans, with Essenes. Baithuseans you may reckon with Sadducees or Samaritans, whichever you will. Now this variety, nay contrariety of opinions, that was among this mixture, would afford nourishment to any evil word of doctrine that could be sowed; these being as Manasseh against Ephraim, and Ephraim against Manasseh, but all against the Gospel."

a hubbub of philosophers; every thing intellectual, every thing moral, every thing religious took that turn. There was very little light, and what there was, was fast becoming darkness. The culminating point of light in the world's intellect, apart from revelation, had probably been reached in Plato, and every step after him was a retrograde one. Every new mixture in the cauldron of Alexandrian Eclecticism produced only a thicker scum of error. Every turn in the wild medley of philosophic opinions only made "confusion worse confounded." Yet philosophy was the fashion; it was learning, it was education, it was refinement, it was γνῶσις, the knowledge of God and of creation, of good and of evil, and every religionist must be a philosopher.

Now it was into the midst of this boiling chaos of society, this fermentation of the world's mind, that the first disciples of Christ were thrown to begin their spiritual conflict. We may find in the state of things around them reason enough why illiterate men, so called, were chosen; if any had been taken from the schools, a constant miracle must have been exerted all along the course of inspiration, to preserve them from perpetually mingling the fanaticism and the folly of philosophic speculation, with the theory and truth of Christianity. Amidst these strong tendencies, with not only the Greeks, but the whole world agape after "wisdom," they were set down, simply to preach the gospel. It was a miracle that they preached it, that they did not instantly, on the death of Christ, set up a school of philosophy. But there they stood, simple disciples of an atoning Saviour, and preached *the cross*, knowing nothing but that, and *determined* to know nothing among men, save Christ and him crucified. Thus they stood, through one generation at least, simple preachers and not philosophers, and so the doctrines of Christianity were fairly and fully excogitated, put before the world in freshness and simplicity. It was a wonderful spectacle, a sublime sight,—this light amidst darkness, this simplicity amidst error, this order amidst confusion, these twelve men going about like little children, and talking truth as simple as the daylight, as blessed and as easy to be understood, amidst such a hubbub of pretensions and noises, such universal distortion of mind, such a troop of babbling novelties of error, such admiration and worship of philosophic darkness.

They were faithful to *the cross*, and so the canon of the New

Testament was fixed, the truths of the cross fully and eternally revealed, without mixture or sanction of human error. The orb of Light was hung up, whatever error darkened men's horizon beneath it. But in the multitude, those philosophic tendencies remained, and Christianity had to meet them; and some minds were speedily brought into her bosom deeply tinged with them, and soon many were beguiled from the ἀπλότητος, the simplicity of Christ. Heresy entered with philosophy. Learned converts from Paganism brought with them, from their schools, the habit of subtle speculation; Gnostic, Cabbalistic, Neoplatonic allegory began to be in fashion; professedly Christian teachers contended with unbaptized Pagans for the palm of philosophy; that is, they claimed it for Christianity as a thing to be desired, and the Christian fathers sought to maintain a philosophic reputation.

Some, indeed, opposed this tendency; in the view of Irenæus and Tertullian it was hazardous to combine philosophy with Christianity;* Arnobius and Lactantius also deemed philosophy a superfluous study, and adverse to Christianity.† *Omne hæresim a philosophia subornari*, was the declaration of Tertullian;‡ but notwithstanding the repeated and remarkably earnest warnings of the apostles, especially of Paul, on this subject, the prevalent and increasing opinion was very different. The combination of philosophy with Christianity was deemed by the Alexandrian fathers both salutary and necessary. They held, indeed, that both were derived from the same divine source, Justin Martyr affirming that the Logos, previously to his incarnation, had revealed himself to the philosophers of antiquity.§ To study the philosophy of the Greeks, and to avail themselves of it, was, in their opinion, simply to collect the treasures of divine wisdom scattered through the world, either from the light of revelation or the inspiration of the Logos, and to offer them again at the altar from which they had been stolen.||

For this and other reasons, Clement of Alexandria even considered the Pagan philosophy as an introduction to Christianity.

* Muenscher, Elements of Dogmatic History, § 17.

† Tenneman, Manual Hist. Phil. § 225.

‡ Vitranga De Hæresibus Natis, L. IV. c. 9.

§ Tenneman, § 224, 226.

|| Brucker, Hist. Crit. de Philos. Veterum Christianor. Tom. III. pp. 303—366.

His sentiments on this point may be gathered from the following declaration. "As the husbandman first waters the soil, and then casts in his seed, so the notions, which I derive out of the writings of the Gentiles, serve first to water and soften the earthy parts of the soul, that the spiritual seed may be the better cast in, and take vital root in the minds of men."* In this passage, we may measure something of the influence of philosophy over the Christianity of the early ages; and it is by the prevalence of such a spirit, that we account partly for the manner in which the Gnostic heresies sprung up. A strange preparation indeed,—this baptism of the soul in the troubled waters of Epicurean, Pythagorean, Aristotelian and Platonic mysteries. A strange and monstrous preparation for the severe and simple verities of the gospel! What should we think, nowadays, of preparing for the effective study of Christianity by getting the mind imbued with the puerilities of the same philosophy!† This Alexandrian Eclecticism was pursued and cultivated, not only in the porch of the temple, but in the sanctuary; not only in the schools but in the bosom of the church. And to such a degree did they carry this disposition, in the mistaken view of recommending Christianity to the heathen world, by showing its supposed affinities with heathen philosophy, which they asserted to have been originally derived from it, that it would not be strange if they themselves merited the accusation, which Clemens Alexandrinus brings against the heretics, of being far more anxious to appear to be philosophers than really and truly to philosophize; more desirous to gain the reputation of philosophy than the reality. *Inani ergo sapientiæ opinione elati, perpetuo litigant, aperte ostendentes se magis curare ut videantur philosophi, quam ut philosophantur.*‡

* Clemens Alexandrinus, *Stromata*, I.

† See the excellent remarks of Milner on Pantænus and Clemens Alexandrinus. *Church History*, Cent. III. ch. 3, 4.

‡ Clemens Alex. *Stromata*, Lib. VII. 16. The passage contains a vigorous delineation of the compounded mental and moral obliquity of the Gnostic heresiarchs. We give merely the Latin translation. *Semper enim id potius sumunt quod eis visum fuerit esse evidentius quam quod dictum est a Domino per prophetas, et ab Evangelis quodque Apostolorum estimonio comprobatum est et confirmatum. Cum viderent ergo sibi imminere periculum, non de uno dogmate, sed de*

Now in considering and accounting for the influence of Gnosticism upon Christianity, our point of view is of the greatest importance. We are not asking what it would have been upon men accustomed to the doctrines of the gospel, and imbued with its spirit, but what it was upon men to whom those doctrines themselves were new, and the books in which they were taught new also. The various errors of the Gnostics appear to us, in the light of the whole New Testament, so wicked, so absurd, so monstrous, some of their systems are such complicated and incredible mixtures of Paganism, Philosophy, Christianity and Oriental fiction, that we are at a loss to conceive how they could have commended themselves to any minds that had once known the truth as it is in Jesus. But variety hath ever been more to the taste of men than simplicity. In that age men were so accustomed to form their religious schemes for themselves, that they could not resist the inclination to attach the fungi of their own speculations to the system of gospel truth. The New Testament form of Christianity was too unadorned, severe, simple, casting down imaginations, to suit their diseased habits of thought and feeling. It was too independent of their own opinions, too absolute and careless in the rejection of their own wisdom. They would not have a revelation which should speak from the mind of the Supreme Being alone, but one which should at least have passed through the cloud and sea of their own wild theories and suppositions.

There was a great difference between the authority of revelation then and now; and this we must take distinctly into view, in attempting to measure and account for the influence of Gnosticism upon Christianity. That "there must be heresies among you" was inevitable from the habits of philosophy, falsely so called, unchecked by the powerful resistance, presented for us in the complete and acknowledged canon of the New Testament. The parable of our Lord gives us the history of the whole matter. The Gnostic heresies were sowed along with the good seed of the gospel, and in the midst of it. Heresy and truth therefore sprung up together; whereas, if the doctrines of the gospel had had time to grow up first and get

conservanda hæresi, non veritatem invenire, (nam cum ea quæ sunt in medio posita et in promptu apud nos legerunt, tanquam vilia ea contempserunt,) sed quod est commune in fide superare contententes, excesserunt a veritate.

strongly rooted, and vigorous, then such seeds of error would never have come up at all, or else would have proved only a puny and stunted growth of underweeds. As it was, they grew up into a great and strong crop, and the corn and the vetches were bound in the same sheaves, and sent to the same mill, and ground up together for the food of the Christian church ; so that the poisons and the medicines of the soul were at once digested and circulated, and produced their appropriate hereditary consequences in a diseased and spurious Christianity for many generations.

We are to remember, that however monstrous the systems of the Gnostics appear to us, they presented to the mind of the ancient world, common or philosophic, no greater absurdities, crudities, or puerilities, than all men were accustomed to from childhood, in the various forms of Paganism and Pagan philosophy in which they had been educated. At the same time the genius of Gnosticism was bold and free in its excursions into the spiritual world, giving play to the imagination, and presenting, altogether, such an array of gorgeous attraction as could not but be alluring to minds of a contemplative cast. The want of proof of its dogmas, Mr. Taylor has with a good deal of truth remarked, constitutes one of its peculiar charms.

INFLUENCE OF GNOSTICISM ON CHRISTIANITY.

The method of the fathers in the defence and exposition of Christianity contributed not a little to the growth of error. They were much in the habit of answering objections and making apologies, instead of so preaching Christ and his cross, as to have a great multitude of principles considered as granted. There is, in this respect, a prodigious difference between the aspect of Christianity in the New Testament, and in the writings of the chosen expositors of the Christian scheme, after the age of the apostles. And this constitutes also a great difference between their position and ours. Principles were doubtfully fixed ; the world was steeped in Paganism and Pagan philosophy ; and into this same darkness the early Christian writers seem themselves to have retired backward, from the very foot of the cross, from the very blaze of inspiration. To step out from the New Testament into the writings of the fathers, is to step from a region of light, order, certainty and beauty, into a region of dim, disastrous twilight, where, as the

shades of evening gather, the forms of superstition thicken, and the common sense, and the simple spiritual sense, so rich and full in the pages of the New Testament, almost cease from existence. The forms of divine truth, that is, of truth revealed through the medium of the cross, are dim and indistinct. In proof of this let any one look through the writings of the fathers to trace the great doctrine of justification by faith, so early lost, and at length so profoundly, in the Romish system, and so late discovered in the glorious Reformation, after more than a thousand years. Let any sound-minded Christian take up any work of any Christian father, the most evangelical, and compare it with any treatise, practical or speculative, of Baxter, Howe, Leighton, or other modern Christian writers, and he will be sensible of the vast inferiority of the first to these last ages of Christianity, in the knowledge and possession of the truth and spirit of the Scriptures. There is, it may be, quite as strong a contrast as between the books of the Jewish prophets and those of the fathers, a contrast depicted with very great power and beauty by Mr. Taylor. "It must be acknowledged," he observes, "that the writers of the ancient dispensation were such as those should be, who were looking onward towards the bright day of gospel splendor; while the early Christian doctors were just such as one might well expect to find those who were looking onward toward that deep night of superstition which covered Europe during the middle ages. The dawn is seen to be gleaming upon the foreheads of the one class of writers; while a sullen gloom overshadows the brows of the other."*

We can add nothing to the power of this picture, though we might add much for the corroboration of its truth. The errors of the fathers, and their mode of philosophizing must doubtless be regarded both as cause and consequence of the prevalence of the Gnostic heresy and the Gnostic sentiment. Here, however, we do not limit our declaration to the spread of heresies, declared as such by the church, but refer likewise to the tincture of Gnosticism, or rather the baptism into it, received by some of the fathers, independent of the Gnostic heretics, from the same original sources, from which those heretics gathered their monstrous schemes. From Justin Martyr down to Origen, there appears a series of Platonizing and sometimes Orientalizing

* *Ancient Christianity*; p. 230.

Christian writers and teachers, not excepting even Irenæus himself, who, at the same time that he was employing the whole energies of his mind, and the stores of his learning to refute and confound the crowd of Gnostic heretics, adopted in some respects the ideas and language of the Alexandrian Platonists.*

Next after Justin Martyr comes Tatian, his faithful disciple, whom Brucker denominates one of the Christian fathers, although after the martyrdom of Justin, he fell into such a variety of absurd opinions. His system was full of the Oriental philosophy, manifested even in his apology for Christianity, entitled *Oratio ad Græcos*, which his contemporaries greatly admired. He founded the heresy of the Encratitæ, and in him, it would seem, there was a nearer alliance of Christianity and Gnosticism, than ever elsewhere came to a practical focus in the Christian church,—except, perhaps, in Origen,—for he condemned the use of wine, denied the lawfulness of marriage, disbelieved the reality of Christ's sufferings, embraced the Æons of Valentinus, and even, it is said, asserted with Marcion that there are two Gods.† He was a Syrian, and derived his sentiments from the Egyptian and Cabbalistic philosophy. Theophilus of Antioch, Athenagoras, Irenæus, Tertullian, and Clemens Alexandrinus follow in the Platonizing train. Clemens Alexandrinus, by being the successor of his master, Pantæus, over the old Eclectic school of philosophy in Alexandria, as well as by his great ability and erudition, exerted a prodigious influence over all Christian antiquity, and not merely for good, but, by his Gnostic and Platonic tendencies, an influence for evil inferior only to that of his celebrated pupil, Origen. He was the last of the Christian Eclectics, previous to the new establishment of the school of Alexandria under Ammonius. "I espoused not," he says, "this or that philosophy, Stoic, Platonic, Epicurean or Aristotelian, but whatsoever any of these sects had said that was fit and just, and taught righteousness with a divine and religious knowledge, τὸντο σύμψαν τὸ ἐκλεκτικόν, all that being selected, I call philosophy."‡

Ammonius was born of Christian parents, and instructed in Alexandria under Athenagoras, Pantæus and Clemens Alexandrinus. Brucker supposes that Porphyry's relation is true in

* Brucker, Tom. III. 408. Tenneman, 177, 202.

† Lardner, Credib. Part II. 148.

‡ Cave, Life of Clemens, § 3. Brucker, Tom. III. 414.

regard to his apostatizing from the Christian faith, and as a proof of it urges his acceptance of the chair of philosophy in a Pagan school, and the crowd of disciples opposed to Christianity, who followed him. He had eminent followers, both Pagan and Christian, Longinus and Plotinus among the first, and Origen of the last. In the seminary of Ammonius, Origen completed his theological education. What an anomaly it exhibits! A student of Christianity, preparing for the Christian ministry under the instructions of a heathen philosopher! For aught we can see, however, the seminary of Ammonius was as truly a theological seminary, as that of Pantænus and Clemens; the difference seems to have consisted simply in the different sides from which each made his advances, and perfected his Eclecticism, towards the other system. The Christian philosophers and theologians took their stand in Christianity, and *eclecticised* from heathenism; the Pagan philosophers and theologians took their stand in heathenism and *eclecticised* from Christianity; and the last claimed to be the most perfect, finished and universal form of Eclecticism, and, therefore, the most enlightened and liberal school of theology; for it comprehended Christianity, as well as all other theological and philosophical systems. Here, at any rate, Origen seems to have finished his preparation for the ministry.

The philosophic enthusiasm reached its height in Origen, after the establishment of the school of Ammonius, and, through him,—by means of that allegorizing method of interpretation learned from the Orientals, adopted by the Cabbalists and Alexandrian Platonists, and applied to the Scriptures,—poured like a deluge into the Christian church. The followers and disciples of Origen, and those, in the language of Brucker, *quos doctrina sua pascebat*, were almost innumerable, and some of them of great celebrity. The errors and evils, with which the principles and modes of interpretation and teaching, adopted by this father, afflicted the Christian church, form an important material in ecclesiastical history. Origen took the charge of the Christian catechetical school in Alexandria, after the death of Clemens, and, like Clemens, taught philosophy as an introduction to Christianity, among a great multitude of pupils, who, according to the testimony of Gregory Thaumaturgus, day and night hung upon his lips. In this way he had great opportunity for diffusing his peculiar sentiments,—an opportunity enjoyed up to the close of his life in Cesarea, where also, as be-

fore in Alexandria, he taught philosophy, sacred and profane, to numerous pupils. A thorough compendium of the tenets of Origen may be found in Brucker's *Historia Critica Philosophiæ*, with some computation of the wide-spread and long-continued evils consequent upon them. They are to be traced to the schools of Alexandrian philosophy, and to that same Oriental system of emanations adopted by the Gnostics and the Jewish Cabbalists.*

After the period of Origen, from the third century down to the sixth, and onward almost indefinitely, a succession of Christian Platonists is traced in the history of theology and philosophy, till all distinctive forms of both are merged and lost in the superstitions and ignorance of the Romish hierarchy. A survey of the history of philosophy, during these six centuries, will do more than any thing else towards solving the question as to the causes and extent of the influence of Gnosticism on Christianity. Nor is it possible for any man to consult the pages of such a historian as Brucker, and not be astonished at that worship of the Christian fathers, which of late, as a part of the singular ascetic outburst in the English church, and for the sake of supporting the detestable tenet, that tradition from the fathers, and not private opinion, is to be the interpreter of Scripture, some men of Popish affinity have attempted to revive. It were easy to illustrate by examples their weak and far-fetched reasonings, their interpretations contrary to all laws of hermeneutics;† the innumerable supposititious books admitted by them for true and genuine,‡ and their ignorance of that critical art and acumen by which to distinguish what is genuine from what is spurious;§ their affected and allegorical style, loaded with false ornaments; their entire ignorance of natural philosophy and physical science; their belief in the divine inspiration of the Septuagint translation,|| and the errors and false reasonings consequent thereon; their absurd and superstitious rigor in some details of moral discipline, their looseness, at the same time, in important matters of moral principle,—holding for instance that

* Brucker, Tom. III. 338, 458. Ita vero novo exemplo docendi lectorem occasionem nacti sumus, quos pestilentes fructus Orientalis illa philosophia in Ægypto Platonismo adaptata tulerit, et quam gravia inde damna in Ecclesiam profecta sint.

† Brucker, Vol. III. p. 349.

‡ Idem, 354.

§ Idem, 359.

|| Idem, Tom. III. 362.

it is lawful to defend the truth by deceit and fraud ;* their inculcation of a holiness diverse from, and arrogantly pretending to be supererogatory above, that which is commanded in the Scriptures, and all the evil consequences flowing from it in monasticism, celibacy, and the whole train of connected Roman Catholic monstrosities.† These weaknesses and errors are common to the best of them. We may hear Lactantius arguing against idolatry, “because God dwells in the regions above and not beneath, whereas idols are made out of stones dug from the earth, and, therefore, cannot be proper objects of worship.”‡ We may hear Chrysostom arguing that “second marriages are public fornication, licensed and permitted by God.”§ We may hear Clemens Alexandrinus forbidding the use of mirrors to females, and not blushing *eas meretrices vocare*, if they form an image of their countenance, “because they violate the law of Moses, not to make any image of any thing in heaven above or earth beneath.”|| We may see Augustine offering up prayers for the souls of his dead parents,¶ and we may hear the same father declaring that “it is an infinitely smaller crime to return drunk from celebrating the memories of the martyrs, than to sacrifice to them while fasting!”** These, however, are mere details. If any of our readers wish for a farther and more powerful elucidation of the preaching and teaching of the fathers in its spirit and tenor, they have but to peruse a few chapters in the recent publication of Mr. Taylor’s exposition of Ancient Christianity.

* Brucker, Tom. III. 362. † Idem, 363. ‡ Idem, 351.

§ Idem, 360. || Idem, 361.

¶ Aug. Confessions, L. IX. 32–37.

** Beausobre, Hist. du Manichæisme, Tom. II. 687. In Augustine’s Confessions, in the account of the offerings of his mother, Monica, at the tombs of the martyrs, the Roman Catholic worship of saints may be seen in progress. Augustine and his mother seem both to have supposed that wine, placed upon the tomb of a martyr, communicated grace to him who should drink it. Augustine praises the piety of his mother, in visiting all these sacred shrines, but as, if she had swallowed a glass of wine at each of them, after getting it sanctified by contact with the tomb, and had done this for all the martyrs in Milan, she “would have run the risk of getting drunk with wine rather than with grace,” Augustine praises her watchfulness and sobriety in taking but a very little swallow at each altar. Aug. Conf. L. VI. 3, as quoted by Beausobre.

The author of this able and admirable work, in answer to the Oxford tracts, has traced the influence of Gnosticism in the church, and of "that awful mistress of the ancient world, the *Oriental theosophy*," with more discernment and acuteness than any other writer on the subject. It is the knowledge of Gnosticism, not as a heresy, but as a feeling, with which he investigates the labyrinth, and traces the progress of that "*Gnostic sentiment*," which, even when the Gnostic heresies were the most strenuously resisted, held possession of the religious mind, almost universally, along the shores of the Mediterranean, and during a full seven hundred years." "It is to this Gnostic feeling, preoccupying all minds religiously disposed, that we must trace most of those peculiarities of sentiment and practice, which make up the striking contrast between the apostolic and the Nicene church."

GNOSTICISM IN THE ROMISH CHURCH.

A more severe yet just delineation of the Romish system never was penned in so short a compass as the following sentence. "*Gnosticism surviving in principle, and polytheism in ritual, make up together the bastard religion of the middle ages, otherwise called Popery.*" It would not be difficult to prove this in detail, by tracing the extent and influence of the errors of the Gnostics as adopted and canonized in the mighty kingdom of the MAN OF SIN. They deserve also to be traced and noted as, in essence, the same with the systems of modern Unitarianism and Antinomianism. Not unfrequently modern heresies are nothing but the old ones cobbled and vamped, or put together with more ingenuity and refinement.

The first and grandest in the combination of error and iniquity, in the monstrosities of Gnosticism, was its utter annihilation of the doctrine of the atonement. This was practical and pervading. And whatever influence Gnosticism, in the mass, exerted upon Christianity, this feature of its errors must have been powerful. One would think there had never been any spiritual idea of an atonement for sin developed in the minds of the authors of some of these systems, that they had never formed a conception of this as the grand truth of Christianity. And we doubt if they ever had. There must, otherwise, have been some little care taken to preserve something like an avowal of this doctrine, some little appearance of regard for it. And we

are compelled to draw an inference, very unfavorable to the prevalent mode of preaching, or of expounding the Christian doctrine, when systems, destitute of this truth, could be palmed upon the world, for a moment, as the exhibition of Christianity.

The ruling principle of Gnosticism, which was the essential evil of matter, forbade the acknowledgment of an atonement for sin by the sufferings and death of Christ, had this doctrine been ever so clearly understood or conceived of by the Gnostics. It implied, of necessity, a real existence of Christ in the flesh, and this the Gnostics denied, if on no other ground, on that of the inherent malignity of matter. The whole created universe, and all material forms or mediums of existence in it, they asserted to have been the work of a malicious being, who had linked men themselves with matter, from the bondage of which Christ had come to deliver them. While, therefore, they "confessed not that Christ Jesus had come in the flesh," denying his bodily death, resurrection and ascension, they maintained a form of belief in him as a Saviour, that is, a deliverer from the dominion of matter, and thus preserved, in this direction, the appearance of a link attaching their system to Christianity. The expiatory sacrifice of Christ they must deny; because, if that had been admitted, their whole system must fail. But they must, in some way or other, retain a Saviour in their system, and profess to derive authority from him, because, without this, their system, pretending to be the Christian system, must equally fail also.

There is a striking resemblance here between the Gnostics and that sect, which, in modern times, professing a similar regard to Jesus Christ as a teacher and deliverer by precept and example, and thus retaining the word Christian for their scheme, does yet reject wholly the distinguishing tenet of Christianity, the expiatory sacrifice of Christ for the sins of the world. The Gnostics did this because the admission of that tenet supposed the union of Christ, a spiritual being, with a base material body; the Unitarians do this, because its admission supposes a higher nature for the Redeemer of the world, than they are inclined to grant him. The Gnostics denied the atonement, because it degraded Christ to the level of a man; the Unitarians deny it, because it elevates him to an equality with God. On other points, as their treatment of the Scriptures, and their salvation by a system of morality, there is an equally striking similarity. Extremes meet.

The Roman Catholic church, while abjuring in form this


heresy of the denial of the atonement, has as effectually, in practice, abolished the doctrine. Her daily sacrifice of the mass does this in one direction; her system of penances and works of self-righteousness does it in another. And in this latter direction the influence of Gnosticism becomes visible. It was apparent long before the church was named *Roman Catholic*. "The Catholic church," remarks Mr. Taylor, "while vigorously repelling the openly pronounced and more distinct forms of the Gnostic delusion, too soon yielded itself to the undefined and the more seductive Gnostic principle, which made the conditions of animal life, and the common alliances of man in the social system, the antithesis of the divine perfections, and so to be escaped from and decried by all who panted after the highest excellence. It was this Gnostic leaven, which, through the medium of some ardent minds, gained at length a firm hold of the Christian community, and became the germinating cause of so much of the ascetic institution, as was not expiatory, as well as of many of those superstitions which have continued to oppress Christianity, even to the present time."* "The existence at any time, or in any community, of penitential and expiatory ascetic sacrifices, affords a sufficient and unquestionable proof of a corresponding compromise of that first principle of Christianity,—the full and free pardon of sin through the expiatory and vicarious sufferings of him, who was made a sin-offering for us." The last of the apostles had not departed from the world, when already this compromise began to take place. That it wholly and exclusively originated in the Oriental philosophy, we are not prepared to assert; on the contrary, we believe it would, at some period or other, have been manifested, if the Oriental belief of the sinfulness of matter had never existed. That belief passing into the Christian church, through the medium of Gnosticism, sustained and fostered an original disposition of human depravity, till it usurped the place of the whole Christian system.

The same belief in the inherent turpitude of matter, which led the Gnostics to reject the atonement, and to deny that Christ had come in the flesh, was likewise the parent of a monstrous Antinomianism. This belief led them to regard all evil as of the body only, the soul not participating in it. From this to the

* *Ancient Christianity and the Doctrines of the Oxford Tracts*, p. 215.

tenet that whatever pollution of sensuality the body is guilty of, the soul is superior to it, and unaffected by it, the passage was plain and easy. Where the consequences of this feature of the Oriental philosophy did not make their appearance in actual Antinomianism, it was not less fatal to religion in preventing and weakening the conviction of spiritual wickedness, the conception of that carnal mind which is enmity against God. We doubt if the nature of sin was any better understood, or any more faithfully expounded, as a spiritual evil, than the nature of the atonement. This all-prevailing, all-powerful Gnostic tenet of the turpitude of matter led to corporeal flagellations and mortifications, asceticism and penance in all its forms; and "bodily exercises" innumerable, which the apostle condemns, filled the church as the means and essence of righteousness; but of that holiness, without which no man shall see the Lord, there was as little true spiritual conception, as there was of the meaning of *the blood of Jesus Christ, which cleanseth from all sin*.

Here we must close our discussion of this deeply interesting and important subject, as involved, and intricate, in some respects, as it is important. We might, indeed, carry it down clear through the scholastic philosophy and theology, and the Roman Catholic idolatry and morality of the middle ages. The investigation legitimately demands this; nor can any man understand the middle ages, without viewing them in the light, or rather in the darkness, of the Oriental-Platonic-Gnostic philosophy and religion that preceded them. The following diagram may be taken as a condensation, not only of the course of our present discussion, but of the entire result of all ecclesiastical history down to the Reformation. Christianity married to Polytheism, through the medium of Philosophy in Orientalism, Platonism and Gnosticism, and then in the Romish hierarchy, canonized as Popery and Antichrist.



ARTICLE II.

REVIEW OF CLARK'S SERMONS.

By the Rev. George Shepard, Prof. of Sac. Rhet. in the Theol. Sem., Bangor, Me.

Sermons ; by Rev. Daniel A. Clark, Author of "Conference Sermons," "Church Safe," &c. &c. In three volumes. New-York : John S. Taylor. 1836, 1837. pp. 323, 328, 324.

REV. DANIEL A. CLARK deservedly takes a place in the first rank among American preachers. We are glad that, though dead, he is speaking so eloquently and so extensively through the press. We wish the volumes contained more sermons of the spirit and stamp of those before us. There is very little reason to fear that too many good sermons will be published from the press. It is admitted that the appetite for printed sermons in the community is not very keen. The majority prefer something lighter and more frothy. Yet there are many who keep up the taste of the olden time, who love to read well constructed sermons; and they are intellectually the sounder and more solid part of the community. Indeed it takes a good mind to compass and relish a good sermon; and the reading and relishing of one makes the mind stronger, clearer and better. It is profitable reading, mentally as well as spiritually. The reasoning power is improved by studying well arranged and well reasoned sermons. The rhetorical perception becomes quicker and truer, from dwelling upon those that bear the simple elegance of a Nevins, or the more splendid combinations of a Hall. We do not remember to have heard an individual declare that he took pleasure in perusing discourses, at once close, argumentative and eloquent, but we found out, upon acquaintance, that that person had a mind, in many respects, far above the common level.

We might remark upon the spiritual benefit,—the amount of biblical and doctrinal knowledge gained by this species of reading. But we pass these topics, that we may come at once to other things.

It is proposed to give, in the first place, a rapid sketch of

Mr. Clark's history ; secondly, an estimate of his powers and influence as a sermonizer and a preacher.

Mr. Clark was born in Rahway, N. J., March 1, 1779. His father, David Clark, was a devoted patriot of the revolution ; and his allegiance to his country often brought his property and his family into peril ; so that our author was accustomed to say, " that he was cradled in a whirlwind." He was blessed from earliest years with the prayers and instructions of an eminently pious mother, whose maiden name was Elizabeth More. In his own language, descriptive of her influence,

A child of prayer, he knew a mother's worth,
Knew well the silken cords she round him flung,
To hold him back from crime, and wo, and death.

There seems to have been a peculiarly vigilant and austere faithfulness on the part of his mother. The son, in his youth, was rebellious and headstrong, and hated the restraint, the mother so rigidly imposed. He wished to be indulged in his favorite amusements, particularly that of dancing, of which he was very fond. His mother was inexorable in her prohibition. He would get away by stealth and engage in it with the merry company, and then go home to suffer all the agonies of remorse. After one of these seasons of stolen indulgence, he says : " I felt a part of hell in my bosom. I could not sleep ; my whole system was so agitated, that at length the bedstead shook ; I began to think that God would bear with me no longer, but would cut me off in my sins." He was often in like distress ; and it was his mother's counsels and prayers that kept him in this trouble, while he persisted in sin. At length a mother's prayers were hopefully answered. In 1795, there was some attention to religion in Elizabethtown, N. J., in connection with the labors of that eccentric minister, Rev. David Austin. On the first day of May, he attended worship in Elizabethtown, where a number were to be received to the church by profession. He went with no purpose or desire to get good. Being fatigued by a long walk, he fixed himself in a position for repose. But as soon as Mr. Austin commenced his sermon, he was arrested and interested. He did not *mean* to hear, but he did ; the truth took sudden and strong hold of him. In the progress of the sermon he was melted down, and all his feelings toward God and his people seemed to be changed. He retired to pray and meditate ; it was the first Sabbath that he

ever tried to keep, or enjoyed as a Sabbath. This day was succeeded by months of conflict, doubt, and sometimes despair. His circumstances were unfavorable; his trials many. His mind seemed dark, stubborn, stormy, and, in his own phrase, "gloomy as death." He manifestly had not, as yet, seen clearly the way of salvation through the cross of Christ. One Sabbath morning in April, he walked the fields in extremest agony, and several times fell on his face in utter despair of mercy, and in that attitude tried to pray, but could not. In connection with the privileges and instructions of the day, he obtained relief. He gained a sweet view of Christ, and peace sprang up in his breast. He says: "I had a charming evening and night, almost all of which I spent in the same fields." Thus the same fields were trodden at morning in misery, at evening with joy. Such is the power of Christ seen by faith. On the first of May, 1796, just one year from the memorable Sabbath referred to above, Mr. Clark joined the church, and took his seat among the followers of the Lamb.

He soon formed the purpose of preparing for the ministry; and, in 1802, commenced his academical studies under the care of Rev. Dr. Finley of Baskinridge. He entered Princeton College in 1805, and graduated in 1808, with so high a reputation for scholarship, that the offer of a tutorship was made to him. He however declined it, that he might enter at once upon his professional studies; which he did, under the direction of the Presbytery of New-York. In May, 1809, he left Newark in company with Dr. Griffin for Andover; the latter to be a teacher in that infant Seminary, the former a student. His residence at Andover was from one to two years. In the course of it, the place was favored with a revival of religion, in which Mr. Clark was very deeply interested, and for the promotion of which he labored with great zeal and success. In October, 1810, before finally leaving Andover, he was examined and licensed to preach the gospel by the Presbytery of New-Jersey. On January 1, 1812, he was ordained a minister of the gospel, and installed pastor of the congregational Union Church of Braintree and Weymouth. In June of the same year, he was married at Portland, to Miss Eliza Barker, daughter of Dr. Jeremiah Barker, of Gorham. The field, in which Mr. Clark commenced his ministry, was a somewhat difficult and rugged one. He seems to have entered and continued in it with many trials. Here he remained, strongly and

pointedly proclaiming the great truths of the Bible, till the fall of 1815, when the state of his wife's health, which demanded a milder atmosphere, together with the opposition arrayed against him, induced him to seek a dismissal. This he obtained and removed to New-Jersey, and labored through the winter at Hanover, amid scenes of religious interest. After a brief ministry of three or four years in Southbury, Connecticut, of which there are no records at hand, Mr. Clark accepted a call from the first church and society in Amherst, Mass., and was installed Jan. 26, 1820; Rev. Mr. Porter of Farmington preaching on the occasion.

At this time Mr. Clark was in the maturity and full strength of his faculties; and it was here that he prepared and preached some of his ablest sermons. Amongst those listened to with peculiar interest, was a series on the text: "For if the trumpet give an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself to the battle;" which, with many more of his best discourses, were unfortunately lost, by being lent to a clerical friend. There was one season of special religious interest, during his ministry in Amherst, which he watched over with great solicitude, and labored most abundantly to promote. There was also a revival in college, which acquired impulse and purity from his bold and fervid preaching. The college owes much to Mr. Clark, for his eloquent pleadings and generous efforts in its behalf, during its precarious infancy.

Mr. Clark had trials in this field. There sat upon his case one of the ablest and most imposing councils we have ever witnessed. There were thronged assemblies, and eloquent advocates, and venerable judges. The result was altogether favorable to the pastor. "With full confidence in his ability and disposition to be highly useful, the council cordially tendered to their brother and friend their affectionate salutations."

Soon after this, Mr. Clark withdrew from Amherst, in acceptance of a call to the church in Bennington, Vermont, where he was installed June 14, 1826. His early friend and teacher, Dr. Griffin, was a member of the Council, and preached the sermon on the occasion. It was a peculiar satisfaction to him, to be in the vicinity of that venerable man, to whom he owed so much, and whom he loved so well. Dr. Griffin was often at his house, and in pleasant familiarity would pat him on his shoulder and call him his boy.

His ministry here was a laborious and successful one. As

heretofore, he proclaimed the truth and assailed wickedness with great faithfulness and boldness: and the Spirit gave it efficacy, and stubborn wills were bowed beneath it. But while some submitted, others were more malignantly aroused. One instance is related of threatening hostility, which resulted in a very remarkable way. A few fellows, in their desperation, banded together violently to break up an inquiry-meeting, held at the court-house. They armed themselves with stones and proceeded to the place. When they came in sight of the house, they were met by a power they had not thought of. The stones fell from their hands, and the greater part of them went reverently in, and submitted their minds to the instructions and influences, which just before, in their hatred, they meant to abolish. Neither the particulars of this work, nor of his ministry in this place, are now at hand.

He received a dismissal from his charge here, and in the fall of 1830 went to Troy, N. Y., to supply the pulpit of Dr. Beman, who found it necessary to travel to the South on account of his health. He seems to have entered upon this field with great earnestness, and performed, during his stay, a vast amount of labor. He adventured, in concurrence with the session, upon what was altogether a new thing in that region, "a four days' meeting." He felt the responsibility of the measure; he called in the assistance of his brethren, and called upon the church to pray. Many were convicted and brought to the knowledge of the Saviour, and a powerful revival extended throughout the city and to many places in the vicinity. Mr. Clark's labors in this place were highly appreciated, and will be remembered by many, with joyful interest, to the ages of eternity. He subsequently labored in Utica and vicinity, in places where God was pouring out his Spirit. His preaching was much sought after, and very highly prized in these scenes of hallowed interest.

On July 17, 1832, Mr. Clark was installed over the Presbyterian church in Adams, Jefferson Co., N. Y. This was his last charge, and his labors here were brief, being obliged, by the state of his health, to withdraw at the end of little more than a year. His iron constitution, which had stood firm under the hardest labors and most heaving emotions, now gave way. On Saturday, he poured out his fervid eloquence and searching appeals to assembled and listening minds, at Sackett's Harbor. On the Sabbath, he preached to his own people. On

Monday he was requested to return to the Harbor, as the truths of Saturday were taking effect. To the surprise of his friends, he refused. On the same day, he attempted to write the skeleton of a sermon, which he handed to his wife, and said, with great emotion: "I am done. I cannot read that paper. I leave you a widow, and my children orphans." "Never to my dying day," says one of his sons, "shall I forget the manner, in which my father received the unwelcome evidence, that his disease had laid hold upon his vitals." From that moment his great strength was gone. He took leave of his people, and, in the fall of 1833, removed to New-York, where, after a few weeks, he was attacked with his first stroke of paralysis. Various means were resorted to, to arrest the progress of the disease, but in vain. In the fall of 1834, he went to the South, and spent the winter at Charleston, S. C. Here he preached occasionally, and contributed to the New-York Observer his "First Impressions of Charleston," with the signature, "A bird in the air." Subsequently he resided for a season in New-Haven, where he preached his last sermon. He employed himself, in the intervals of comparative strength, in writing for different periodicals, and prominently in preparing for the press, and superintending the publication of the three volumes of sermons, which came out in 1836 and 1837, and which we have placed at the head of this article.

His disease at length came upon him in renewed and severer attacks, till it broke down the strong texture of his mind. He often expressed the wish, that he might die in the possession of his faculties, and with his hopes of heaven firm and bright. While he was favored with some seasons, such as he desired, it was often his lot to lie, both mentally and spiritually, under a cloud. During these seasons, there were occasionally decisive indications of the strong religious habit of his mind, and of his warm attachment to the cause of Christ. After he had lost the power of speech and even of consciousness, as it was thought, a friend related in his room the particulars of a work of grace in Broadway Tabernacle where he loved to attend church. He received the intelligence, and it seemed to thrill his bosom, for he cast forth, at the close, a beaming glance, and then burst into tears. Zion, for whose welfare he labored in life, he loved in death. On March 3, 1840, without a struggle or a groan, he calmly fell asleep in Jesus.

In the *social character* of Mr. Clark, there was much sim-

plicity and frankness. He was ever ready to declare his sentiments with a free, bold independence. This trait, existing in connection with a deficiency of worldly tact and management, not unfrequently brought him into circumstances of trial and difficulty. Hence it was, that wherever he went, he had many very warm friends, and some as warm enemies.

In his *religious character*, Mr. Clark seems not to have been characterized by the cheerful and hopeful. In the fine language of Robert Hall, he did not so much "soar to the heights, as sound the depths of Christian piety." Instead of "regaling himself with fruit from the tree of life, he was often on the waves of an impetuous sea, doing business in the mighty waters." With all his experience of human depravity, and his profound estimate of its malignant and dreadful energies, he had firm confidence in the greatness of the atonement, and the greater energies, already pledged and soon to be put forth, in the subjugation of a world to Christ.

He loved to contemplate God as on the throne, the Almighty Sovereign in the kingdom of nature and of grace, achieving his benignant purposes, bringing into service the wrath of his foes, securing the redemption of unnumbered souls, and the glory of his own great name. He loved revivals of religion, and ever deemed it a privilege, and was prompt to labor in the midst of them. It was a gratification to him, if, by his efforts, he could benefit the sinner or the disciple. When an obscure woman, in the interior of New-York, pressed through the crowd, that she might grasp the hand that wrote "The Church Safe," and express her gratitude for the benefits she had received, he replied to her, with strongly gushing emotions: "My good woman, I am thankful to the Lord if my poor labors have been useful to you."

Mr. Clark prayed like a man who was accustomed to the exercise. He prayed in the sanctuary with great fervor, often, with a surprising richness and scope of sentiment. His range and variety were indeed remarkable. He was loth to cease praying with others, when his faculties had become exceedingly impaired. He prayed with his family, after he had so far lost the power of articulation, that they could not understand him. In his clearer moments, he would call them around his bed, that he might again commend them to God. He attached, also, the highest importance to the intercessions of the church. He was the first that proposed the observance of the first Monday of

January, as a day of prayer for the conversion of the world. He proposed it to the Presbytery of Watertown, N. Y., and as chairman of their committee, he drafted the memorial to the General Assembly, requesting that body to take order in favor of that concert. They did so, and recommended the observance of it to the churches.

In his *professional career*, Mr. Clark was hearty and laborious. He loved to preach; and he gratified this affection by preaching a great deal, both in season and out of season. Sometimes, when on a journey, as he stopped for a night in a village, he would make his arrangements, issue a notice, cause the bell to be rung, and preach to those who might assemble and in the morning go on his way. He performed a great amount of neighborhood preaching. It was not uncommon for him to preach nine times a week. His constitution was a strong one, as it must have been, to sustain the earnest labors of twenty-one years, with the loss of but a single Sabbath from ill health.

The intellectual features of Mr. Clark will be brought out in connection with our examination of his Sermons. It will appear that he had strong powers, which, at almost any time, he could put under the highest pressure of feeling. We shall see that he was not remarkable for the acute, the refined, the wire-drawn; that in him the reasoning faculty was of the practical, common sense sort; the imagination, within certain limits, was vigorous and good; the power of language, original and striking.

We will proceed at once, then, to view Mr. Clark as a sermonizer. We have before us fifty-eight of his Sermons; without doubt, judiciously selected, and constituting a fair representation of his powers in this chief department of ministerial duty.

It is proposed, in our remarks on Mr. Clark's sermons, to look at them rather homiletically than theologically. We shall consider not so much the sentiments contained in them, as their style, structure and spirit as sermons.

In opening the volumes of Mr. Clark at the beginning, we find the distinctive features of the man, even in the table of contents. Many of them are graphic and striking. They excite attention for their strangeness or oddness; and a few for their unintelligibility. An instance of the latter is the following: "A Likeness taken in the Field." This title is objectionable for this reason, that no one could gather from it the subject of the sermon. For explanation, they must

resort to the sermon itself; and on going there we find that the object of the sermon is to "show how the Christian is to act out the spirit of his Master, in efforts to promote the conversion and salvation of the world." The title, being far-fetched and obscure, is not a good one. Some of the others are objectionable on account of an affected peculiarity; for example: "The Bridgeless Gulf," "The Two Champions Contrasted," "The Index Sure," "Perdition a Dark Spot on the Moral Landscape." The practice of embodying the sentiment of a sermon in a brief and graphic title is a very commendable one. The attempt to do it brings, at once, to a sure test the unity and definiteness of the discourse. The title should be both concise and clear; it should be a key to the sermon, and not an enigma which the sermon alone can decipher.

The subjects of these sermons are of a general and permanent interest; and there is a very good degree of variety. They are not, on the whole, strictly, interiorly experimental. Mr. Clark seems not so much at home on topics which lead to a nice analysis of the spiritual man, as upon those which are connected with the security, and the certain triumph of the Christian on the one hand; with the depravity, the madness, the impotence, the sure defeat and the utter shame and ruin of the enemy of God on the other. The two contrasted subjects, "The Church Safe," and, "Nothing Safe but the Church," furnish the field, over which he ranged the most adroitly and powerfully. Mr. Clark takes pleasure in accompanying the church through her conflicts, and in developing the stability of her basis, and the invincible might of her Protector. He loves to group together and accumulate on his pages the perfect evidence of her safety.

Whilst all the subjects are important, it is obvious that they were not, as a general thing, chosen with a view to immediate and visible results. Most readers would infer, that the author, when preparing these sermons, had not so directly in mind the purpose of immediately accomplishing, with God's help, the conversion of sinners, as had Payson, when preparing the valuable sermons of his which have been given to the public. We do not intend to imply, however, that all sermons, in order to be useful, should be constructed with this pointed design and adaptation. The great principles, the fundamental doctrines of Christianity are to be defended and established, as well as illustrated and applied, to the conscience and the heart; and

those sermons, in which this permanent service is ably done, are amongst the most honored and useful, both as proclaimed from the desk, and published from the press.

We find all the great doctrines of the Christian system brought out in the sermons of Mr. Clark, with the utmost distinctness. The trumpet, in no place, gives an uncertain sound. We do not read far to learn, that the author is a firm believer in the doctrines of the Trinity, of the atonement, total depravity, regeneration, election, the saints' perseverance, and eternal reward and punishment.

Whilst the sermons are not formally, dryly doctrinal, in them all we have discussions of great truths and principles, which give them a solid and instructive character. On one page, the attributes and glory of God meet and awe us; on another, the love and offices of Christ attract and give us peace; from another, the Comforter offers to come into our hearts; in this discourse, a picture of human vileness pains and humbles us; in that, the law draws upon us its two-edged sword; in the other, mercy points to the place of refuge from the avenging stroke. The whole gospel is here strongly and discriminately presented. Mr. Clark contended earnestly for the faith and the order of the gospel. His arguments and efforts were rather with the semi-Christian, who professedly received the gospel, but rejected its great doctrines, than with those, who rejected the Bible and all that was in it; or with brethren, who differed from him in some minor shades of sentiment.

In the general arrangement and structure of his sermons, Mr. Clark exhibits a good degree of simplicity. They never appear so elaborately studied, or curiously drawn out, as to cause perplexity to the mind; or as to lead us to the bones for the most striking part of the structure. He frequently adopts the textual mode; and where it is not a breaking up of the words of the text into the heads of the sermon, which he sometimes does, there is a very free statement of topics, one after the other, as they are naturally suggested by the passage chosen as the basis of the discourse. Take for instance the 36th sermon,—“*The honest and faithful ministry*,”—on 2. Cor. 4: 1, 2: “Therefore seeing we have this ministry, as we have received mercy we faint not,” etc. 1. “The mercy of God qualifies men to be his ministers.” 2. “The ministry of reconciliation is an office big with trials.” 3. “This same ministry furnishes an antidote to the wo it generates.” 4. “The text

prescribes that open and ingenuous conduct, which it is the duty of Christ's ministers on all occasions to exhibit." 5. "The text instructs Christ's ministers how they may best commend themselves to the consciences of men,—by manifestation of the truth." 6. "The apostle and his brethren felt themselves urged to faithfulness, by the consideration that God was present." Whoever reads this performance will be satisfied, that a sermon on the textual plan may be replete with interest and power.

The textual division has this advantage; the preacher has an opportunity to bring out the full and rich meaning of the passage in hand. The sermon grows out of the text; separate from the text, it can have no existence; it is biblical and authoritative. We ought not to despise the textual style of proceeding, though some seem to do it, as not being so scholarlike, so conformable to rule, so favorable to unity, and to a logical and symmetrical discourse as some other. It is the style which the heart often inclines to, in its earnest desire to bring forth and make effective the simple gospel upon the souls of men. We have thought, sometimes, that when we have the least disposition to preach ourselves, we have the strongest inclination to arrange our matter in the humble, unpretending textual way.

This more biblical mode, in the hands of Mr. Clark, is admirably vindicated. Few men have the power he exhibits of building striking and interesting paragraphs upon very common-place heads. The plan may be almost stupidly textual; but in the filling up, there will be original and vigorous thoughts, in very cogent language. Perhaps there is no better test of real power than this. The preacher, who will take the common subjects and the common topics of discourse, and imbue them with a more energetic spirit, and invest them with a deeper and more commanding interest, has the very best power and qualification for his work, and will secure the best kind of popularity.

Mr. Clark is not at all a hortatory preacher; he furnishes a good proportion of clear and weighty discussion. He does not assail us with fierce, unbased appeals; never attempts to carry the heart by hurling against it volleys of rattling words. He first packs together a solid body of truth, and then brings that body in contact, either as fire to melt, or as a hammer to break the rock in pieces.

Our author invariably employs the popular and rhetorical

style of reasoning. His arguments are remarkable for a reliance upon Scripture facts to give them force and conclusiveness. In some of his best efforts, there is no other reasoning than a logical adducing and linking together of scriptural facts. The sermon, entitled "The Church with all her Interests Safe," is a fine example of this. Assurance of the proposition is made out, 1, "from the firmness and stability of the divine operations." Under this head, expectation is excited. It is strengthened, 2, by a view of "what God has done for his Church." Under this head, the prominent divine interpositions in favor of Zion's interests are graphically and rapidly sketched. 3. "God is doing *now* just such things as he has done." 4. "The expectation is consummated by a glance at the *promises* and the *prophecies*." As a specimen of the graphic and condensed style with which Mr. Clark proceeds in this kind of writing, we adduce a paragraph or two. In his sketch of what God has done for the church, he says :

"Let us retrace, for a moment, a few pages of her history, and we shall see that when the church was low, he raised her ; when she was in danger, he saved her. Amid all the moral desolations of the old world, the church never became extinct. And he at length held the winds in his fist, and barred the fountains of the deep, till Noah could build the ark, and the church could be housed from the storm. How wonderful were his interpositions when the church was embodied in the family of Abraham ! In redeeming her from Egyptian bondage, how did he open upon that guilty land all the embrasures of heaven, till they thrust out his people ! And he conducted them to Canaan by the same masterly hand. The sea divided, and Jordan rolled back its waters ; the rock became a pool, and the heavens rained them bread, till they drank at the fountains and ate of the fruits of the land of promise. When the church diminished, and her prospects clouded over, he raised up reformers. Such were Samuel, and David, and Hezekiah, and Josiah, and Daniel, and Ezra, and Nehemiah : such were all the prophets. Each in his turn became a master builder, and the temple arose, opposition notwithstanding. Again, under the apostles, how did her prospects brighten ! In three thousand hearts, under a single sermon, commenced the process of sanctification. The very cross proved an engine to erect her pillars ; the flames lighted her apartments, and the blood of the martyrs cemented the walls of her temple, and contributed to its strength and beauty.

Every dying groan alarmed the prince of hell, and shook the pillars of his dreary domain." Vol. III. pp. 139, 140.

We set down "The Church Safe" as, on the whole, the most admirable production of its author. Few sermons have made a stronger sensation on their publication. It was extensively sought and read, and contributed not a little to awaken the benevolent energies of the church, to the enterprise before her. The writer vividly remembers the evening when the village, where he resided, were summoned together to the reading of this sermon, by a young man who had brought it in from abroad. It is no small achievement to have prepared and put forth to the world one such discourse.

The sermon, entitled "The Enemies of the Church made to promote her Interests," is another fine specimen of argumentation from facts. Here, as in the preceding, they are marshalled in the most admirable order. There is a quick and strong movement; at once, rhetorical beauty and flow, and argumentative clenching. The sermon is a good example of a discourse, in which unpalatable truths are set forth and firmly established by the simple force of facts. The facts are so employed as to hedge up the hearer to the conclusion he hates to come to. The obnoxious point is God's sovereignty in the use and disposal, the award and punishment of his rebellious creatures,—a point kindred with that which our Saviour, in a similar way, fixed incontrovertibly upon his hearers, in the village where he had been brought up. It is an example worthy of imitation, whenever we are to propound truths in the face of strong prejudices and passions; let the preacher keep to the ground of God's simple sayings, and the admitted facts of his Providence, and the deep unsilenced monitions of conscience, and if he does not produce conviction and belief of the truth, he will do something toward checking cavils and silencing objections.

Mr. Clark bears some resemblance to President Edwards in his manner of reasoning and discussion. Neither of them falls into the gratuitous blunder of attempting to shore up the divine affirmation of a doctrine, by their own arguments. The doctrine is received upon the divine testimony. This perfectly establishes it. The main object of the argument or illustration is indirectly to do away objections and prejudices, and directly to commend the truth to the hearer's conscience; to make it real, vivid,

convicting, arousing to the sinner's mind. It is the blindness of men which constitutes the grand barrier to the progress and the redeeming results of truth. If the preacher can but give to truth breadth and body, and impart reality to its disclosures men will see it; and the next thing with many will be, they will feel it; finally, the Spirit helping, they will receive it.

The *reductio ad absurdum* is a form of argument, in which our author seems to be much at home. He wields it now and then with terrible, almost annihilating power. In connection with it, there occasionally appears a little spice of satire; and a disposition to confound his opponent and cover him with shame, instead of satisfying and recovering him to the path of truth. In some instances, he runs, in the first place, the erroneous position to its legitimate results, and holds up the glaring absurdities of the case, and then breaks out in a strain of the most vehement reprobation of the obnoxious point. For example, on the error that Christ is a finite created being:

He indebted to another for his own existence, but we must trust in him for eternal life; he our shield, and still he has no power of his own to protect; he our guide, but another must enlighten and guide him; he our intercessor, and still he cannot know when we pray. . . . If there is a scheme, which, rather than any other, charges God foolishly, makes the plainest truth a mystery, and the whole Bible a bundle of absurdities, and proudly conducts all its votaries to death, it is that which thus quenches the light of Israel. Must I choose between it and open infidelity, I would be an infidel. By the same dash with which I blot the name of the Redeemer, I would obliterate the Father, and believe the grave the end of me. I would not waste my time and strength, and torture my conscience, to mutilate the book of God; but would believe the whole a lie, and warm myself in its blaze, and wish I were a brute. Then I would calmly expect one day to be a supper for the worms, free from dread of the worm that shall never die." Vol. III. pp. 176, 177.

There is a similar strain in another sermon, in which the same low views of Christ as above are opposed. Our author is speaking of the incalculable injury, which even a doubt of the proper divinity of Christ would be to the believer:

"That doubt would mar their creed; for they must yield

other doctrines, when their Redeemer has become a creature. That atonement, which he only could make ; that ruin of our nature, which he only can repair ; that ever-enduring hell, from which he only can rescue us ; that Sabbath, which his rising made ; that Comforter, whom he kindly sent ; and that plenary inspiration of the Scriptures, which establishes his divinity, must be all plucked from their creed, and it would stand then, like a pine, lightning-smitten, scorched in its every leaf, and rived to its deepest roots, to be the haunt of the owl and the curse of the forest. When you shall blast my creed like this, you may have, for a farthing, the remnant of my poor, mutilated Bible, and I will sit down and weep life away, over this benighted world, to which is reserved the blackness of darkness forever." Vol. III. p. 88.

These passages are exceedingly powerful and striking ; they were written, unquestionably, under a mighty tide of emotion. Mr. Clark we think often wrote in this mood ; and in the rush of feeling and strength of expression dictated thereby, now and then there would escape from him a sentiment, very nearly transcending the bounds of truth and propriety. We cannot but doubt the correctness and wisdom of declaring or implying, in any connection, that absolute infidelity is rather to be chosen, than that form of Christianity, which denies the divinity of its author.

The style of Mr. Clark is throughout very decisively characterized by strength. It is manifest that he aimed chiefly at this ; that to this he was willing to sacrifice the light and winning graces of language. In his preface, he expresses the conviction, "that writings are often spoiled by too much smoothing and polishing. Hence the present volumes are permitted to go forth with those occasional roughnesses, which, it is hoped, may not give offence, but simply stir up thought and rouse proper feeling." Mr. Clark's prominent faults and excellencies, both in language and spirit, are to be traced to the reaching forth of a fervid and powerful mind for great strength of thought and diction. There is uncommon compactness and condensation in our author's style. There are but few words which can be safely blotted out ; nor, by recasting, can we diminish the space a thought occupies. There is a very sparing use of epithets and qualifying terms. The principal words are selected with so much precision generally, that he succeeds in conveying his idea without the aid of thronging

expletives and adjuncts. When reading him, we are constrained sometimes to pause and admire the amount and pungent force of meaning, conveyed by some single word, or brief combination of words. This is one of the very highest excellencies of style,—every word fraught with meaning. It takes some a long time to get weaned from their love of the jingle of adjectives and adjuncts, though assured, from every quarter, that no other single thing does more to encumber and enfeeble the style. One of the great rhetorical sins in preaching, it seems to us, is overdoing, saying too much on the topics introduced, and especially taking up altogether too much time in saying what we do say.

Mr. Clark has not only strength, he has frequently a simple elegance and harmony. This harmony indeed is very common, when it is not disturbed by a bold and startling harshness. The following is a fair specimen of the often easy and musical flow of the sentences. "Individuals may prosper most when they are nearest destruction. The old world and the devoted cities were never more prosperous, than when their last sun was rising. Men may be ripe for the scythe of death, their cup of iniquity full, while yet their fields wave with the abundant harvests, and the atmosphere is fragrant with the odors of the ripened fruits and flowers, and echoes with the song of the cheerful laborers."

Another attribute for which Mr. C.'s style is remarkable is vivacity. There is nothing about it dry, abstract, dead. Every thing is living, moving. He is almost constantly giving us vivid pictures. He shows great skill in gathering and grouping the interesting circumstances of a scene or case. It is this skilful touching of some characteristic circumstance, which brings before the mind the picture of a whole scene: "How many, once as rich as you, are now poor; or as healthy as you, are now in the grave; had a home as you have, but it burned down; had children, as, it may be, you have, but the cold blast came over them and they died. And was it not kindness in God that saved you what you have?" Another example: "Where had we been if the hand of God had not been under us? To what world had we fled, when some friend was closing our eyes? How employed on the day of our funeral solemnities?" Once more: "Were Christ to come again and put himself in the power of sinners, would not many of our communicants leave the sacrament, and go away to crucify him?"

It is very obvious that nearly all the peculiar freshness and force of these passages is owing to the striking pictures brought before us. Mr. Clark abounds in examples of what Campbell calls "speciality" in the use of terms; that is, the seizing upon those which are particular and determinate, which, of course, present a more vivid image. Our author, we think, is more remarkably characterized by the use of this figure, if it may be called a figure, than any preacher of our acquaintance. We perceive it in every paragraph, almost in every sentence. Everywhere we are met with the specific stroke. Speaking of the rumseller: "He has the heart of a tiger, and blood is his legitimate prey." In another somewhat rough extract from the same discourse: "If the article must be sold for the use, and ruin, and utter damnation of men, I would place at the *tap* the same lying serpent, that handed Eve the apple, that it might appear the very infernal commerce it is." Again, "the lips of profaneness touch the symbols of a dying Christ." Again, "This institution is connected intimately with all that is interesting in the rescue of the idolater from his gods, the papist from his relics and his saints; the Jew from his Talmud; the Mohammedan from his Koran; the African from his chains, and the assassin from his pistol and his knife."

To speak of a property kindred with the above, we may add, that Mr. Clark's style is enlivened and strengthened with a great deal of rapid and bold metaphor. It is everywhere a leading characteristic. He speaks of "reining in the passions;" of "cradling the corrupt passions;" of "feeding the appetite;" "blunting the reason;" "killing the keenness of conscience;" of "hewing down men in the prime of life;" of "being harnessed for the divine service;" of "digging after comforts;" of "fencing the truth from the sinner's dying pillow;" of "wading to the grave in tears." These are specimens; and some of them manifestly border, to say no more, upon a visitation of good taste; but the book abounds with the like, and many of them are very fine and forcible. "When I heard of this fact, [that ministers were called for, and could not be had,] it had on my ear the effect of a dying groan, and stole through the heart like the cold stream of death." Speaking of a mild, forgiving, unresisting spirit, he says: "thus, by wrestling with the blast, we are liable to be discomfited; when, had we lain down and been quiet, the storm would have beat upon us a little and passed over, and we should have seen the sun again in all his

brightness." Mr. Clark often uses Scripture facts metaphorically and with good effect. "Paul had gone to lay waste that very church, which, a few days after, it was his honor and joy to edify. The devourer was caught with the prey in his teeth and made a lamb." Again, "The gospel may produce wrath and still be a savor of life. The tenant of the tombs raved and then believed." The writer has a vivid recollection of an instance of this sort in hearing him some eighteen years since. The simple stroke did in his mind the work of a dozen sermons. Mr. Clark was addressing Christians at the Lord's table. The sentiment was in substance this: 'Perhaps some are in a luminous, happy frame, and in it they feel confident that they shall no more betray the interests of Jesus, as they have done. Beware of this confidence, Peter thought just so once; yet he went directly down from the scenes of Tabor, and swore that he never knew him.'

It may be remarked in this connection, that our author generally derives his figures and illustrations from obvious and common sources. There is no going out for pretty, and fragrant, and sunny things. There are no singing birds, nor silvery lakes, nor glistening dew-drops to charm us; nothing here of *the fringes of the north star*; nothing of *nature's becoming unnatural*; nothing of the *down of angels' wings*, or the beautiful locks of cherubims; no starched similitudes, introduced with a "thus have I seen a cloud rolling in its airy mansion," and the like. Such things are not fit for the pulpit; they seem profane in so sacred a place. They certainly have no power there. The truly drastic men have nothing to do with them. They are not afraid nor ashamed to lay hands on familiar objects. These are understood, they are felt by the hearer. "I will wipe Jerusalem as a man wipeth a dish, wiping it and turning it upside down." What can exceed this in strength and impressiveness? The Bible is full of the most cogent figures; cogent from the commonness of the objects. In this way Mr. Clark attained to a startling power in many of his illustrations. "The truth exhibits impenitent men as playing the fool with their own best interests. A madman in a paroxysm of his disease, has butchered his family, and half despatched himself, and has waked to consciousness in the very act of suicide, is scarcely a sorer picture of wretchedness and ruin, than the sinner upon whose conscience there has been suddenly poured the light of truth." The following is singularly coarse, and huge, and

strong: "One might almost as well attempt to silence the opinion of heaven as hell. The murmurs of that dark world, against the man who casts its burning sentiments behind his back, will be like the distant roar of a thousand cataracts, or like the dashing of as many icebergs, conflicting with each other in some boundless polar sea." Our author in reaching after strength, not unfrequently, borders upon extravagance in his illustrations. Speaking of the fact, that the wicked are occasionally strangely spared, while the righteous are cut down, he says: "the basest of human beings have sometimes measured out a hundred years, have attended the funeral of every pious contemporary, and have even blown the trumpet of revolt in three centuries."

And here we may remark, that this love of strength not only runs into extravagance sometimes but into harshness. On the passage, "Christ gave himself for us, &c." he says: "How easily could he have blighted all our hopes in that dark hour. Had he sent Judas to his own place, or rendered him an honest man, when he came to steal the betraying kiss; or had he struck lifeless that midnight band which came to apprehend him; or had he let down into hell that senate chamber with its mass of hypocrisy, and paralyzed the sinews of the soldiery that crucified him; then had there been none to betray, arrest, or murder the son of God." One other instance: "No error seems too gross to forbid its circulation; the Swedenborgian and the Shaker, who could have collected their creeds nowhere but from the reveries of bedlam, have not failed to gather around them a community of madmen."

This harshness of expression, which is one of Mr. Clark's prominent faults, is kept up and increased by certain offensive terms and phrases, which he uses rather frequently. The sinner is termed a "culprit," a "wretch," a "miscreant;" and our author sometimes puts a halter about his neck as a sign of his state of condemnation. He speaks of the "ravings" and the ragings of the sinner; of the "whole herd of evil-doers;" the "whole gang of gospel opposers." The word *scowl* appears occasionally, and in one instance in an unfortunate connection. "When the church rose upon the theatre, and joined with decency to *scowl* it out of use, it became from that moment a sinking concern."

When speaking of the sinner's perdition, our author sets it forth commonly in the most terrific imagery of the Bible. We

see too often the unquenchable fire, and hear too often the gnashing teeth. Mr. Clark sometimes speaks of all that is unholy in the world and opposed to God apparently in a spirit of recklessness, as though all were worthless and must perish as a matter of course. He sets forth the divine character, occasionally, in an aspect of such terrific, consuming severity, that we hardly dare approach him, even through a mediator. Our author appears in some of his discourses, as though he were wanting in a spirit of deep and holy compassion for sinners; sometimes he speaks of them as though they were his enemies, and as such doomed to an inevitable overthrow. In some of the discourses the truth is presented as against the opposite error; which fact gives the pages in question a harsh and belligerent character. The severity and harshness which mark parts of these discourses are a serious obstacle to their usefulness. Some will be repelled who otherwise would read with delight and profit. We grieve to see this deformity,—and even this had its use,—on so admirable performances. Had there been a little more of the mild, the gentle, the winning, had there been a less frequent appeal to the terrible motives of truth, more of the imbuing of that love which bled on Calvary, Mr. Clark would have stood as a preacher, pre-eminent and complete. But we may not leave what we have to say upon the general strain and spirit of these sermons without adding, that, with all his sternness, and hard, unbending fidelity, Mr. Clark has the power of the pathetic to a very considerable degree. This power grows out of another we have ascribed to him, namely, the power of moral painting. Some parts of the “Church Safe” are fine specimens of the pathetic. The entire sermon, entitled: “The industrious young Prophets,” is throughout graphic and tender, and must have strongly and deeply moved the feelings of the auditors. Speaking of Christians who have gone from abounding privileges, and are now living far away in regions of moral desolation, he says:

“They cannot educate for themselves a ministry and build in the wilderness the unnumbered conveniences they left behind. They have turned their eyes to us, and if we refuse them help we cover them with unmingled despair. . . . The mother who had devoted her children to God, and has gone with them into the western wilds, must die crushed with the tremendous thought, that she became a mother merely that she might people the realms of death. Already she has hung

her harp upon the willows, and there it must hang, till some kind missionary enter the door of her cabin, and wipes away her tears ; and this missionary *we* must educate. Ten long years must still roll away before he arrives, and she in the mean time, bleached by the frosts of age, trembles on the brink of the grave, but dares not die, till her hopes are accomplished and her children saved." Vol. III. p. 268.

We might find some fault with the manner in which Mr. Clark concludes some of his sermons. The conclusion is a very important part of a sermon, more important perhaps, than of any other kind of discourse. Dr. Payson, when asked what constituted a good sermon, is said to have replied : " A good ending." In a good ending the interest is sustained to the last ; there are some new things in it. Throughout the discourse the preacher should have a regard to the end, and should reserve some of his best thoughts for that important place. Mr. Clark did not always practise this species of economy, but used up his best thoughts in the previous parts ; consequently there is now and then a falling off in the interest as we approach the close. He manifestly lays himself out the most on the body of his discourse. Sometimes he closes very abruptly, without giving any notice, so that we may gather up our ears for the last words. In other instances, where there is enough in length, there is not enough of application. He makes good reflections ; draws appropriate inferences ; but he does not, so often as we could wish, crowd the conscience of the sinner with the truth he has established and illustrated. And in the appeals which he does make, we think he sometimes employs too prominently the class of motives which are addressed to the instinctive and selfish feelings,—to our hopes and fears, to our love of happiness and dread of misery. The transgressor is shown the good which he may obtain, the misery which he may avoid, by a course of pious obedience. The matter we think should generally be put on the higher ground of obligation,—the intrinsic, unalterable, eternal claims of law, and love, and duty.

On the whole, we must be permitted to reaffirm the opinion we opened with, that Mr. Clark deserves to hold a very high rank as a preparer of sermons. With some peculiar and obtrusive faults, he possessed rare and substantial merits. He was not an imitator ; there appears nowhere upon him the marks of any other man's stamp. As a student of Dr. Griffin, he was probably incited and influenced by that gigantic model. Yet

his style is not Griffin's, nor does it bear any resemblance, except in a bold, rough, independent power. Every thing our author said came forth with his own characteristic impress.

Having now examined the instruments our author employed, their material and their structure, it seems necessary to the completeness of our estimate, that we look at our author's style of wielding the instrument ; in other words, that we view him *as a preacher of his sermons*. His smiting was generally with a blade which he had previously fabricated and furbished, though he could make a good one at the time when it was necessary ; in other words, he ordinarily preached on the Sabbath sermons which had been written carefully and in full.

And here we wish to say, that in Mr. Clark we have an example of interest and power in manuscript preaching. He did not read ; he *preached* from his manuscript. He took not the matter from his memory, he took it from his paper, and preached it. It was as really a specimen of preaching, and good preaching, as any improviser can give. He showed that written preaching need not be dull preaching ; that it may be warm and stirring to the highest degree. Why may it not be as frequently as the off-hand ? Why need a man be so much of an animal, that he can get warm only in a room with other animals ? Why may he not grow warm in the solitude of his closet, in the company of quickening truth and of his own glowing thoughts and conceptions ? If he has got a soul, why not enkindle it by its own intrinsic life into quick and impassioned movement ? This has been done. As matter of fact, the most vivid, pointed and heated appeals, that ever went from human heart or lips, were most considerately, yea, elaborately prepared in solitude. Most will concede that Mr. Clark is sufficiently pungent and heated. We love to meet with new instances of stirring power in the use of the pen. We are grateful to our author for these warm-hearted specimens. We deprecate the coming of a time, when ministers shall lay aside the pen in their pulpit preparations. With it they would lay aside one half of their power. There will then be an end to extemporaneous preaching of the highest order. We very much doubt, whether there ever was or ever will be a first rate extemporaneous speaker, who was not, at the same time, a good writer. The discipline of the writing is necessary to impart order and richness to the speaking. Let all writing be done with, and the extemporaneous product grows diffuse and com-

paratively empty. The preacher but rarely leads "into the green pastures:" but more commonly, while under his feeding, are we doomed to be drawn over an arid acre, to gather a gaunt and husky dinner. It is the curse and condemnation of a vast deal of extemporaneous preaching, that it is without beginning, middle, or end, subject or object. "I never write my sermons," said Rowland Hill, "I always trust to the gospel. The gospel is an excellent milch cow, which always gives plenty of milk and of the best quality. I first pull at sanctification; then give a plug at adoption; and afterwards a tit at sanctification; and so on till I have filled my pail with gospel milk." We say decidedly, it is far better to write sermons, than to proceed in this scattering way. The man, who writes in part vigorously and well, will proceed with closeness and order in the sermons he does not write. He may make his written sermons warm, searching, effective; and the unwritten will catch from the written a thorough imbuing and seasoning of the same sterling qualities.

Mr. Clark was an arresting preacher, with all the alleged disadvantages of his paper before him. He had a remarkable power of seizing and holding the attention. If he did not awaken spiritually the auditor, he kept him awake physically. From what we have said of his style, it would be inferred that the house in which he preached would not be much infested with sleepy hearers. They might disbelieve the preacher, they might execrate his sentiments. They could not but hear them if in the house. He must have been a doubly stupid boor, who, by any opiate or any magnetism, could get to sleep under some of the discourses and parts of discourses which proceeded from our author. Whoever, at such a time, might attempt to sink into repose, would not proceed far, before some crashing thunderbolt would compel him to open his eyes, and see what was happening. The roughnesses and rugged points of Mr. Clark's style were admirably adapted to keep the mind well spurred and jogged. Sometimes a sentence or paragraph would come suddenly like a great rasp across the audience. It is admitted, we have repeatedly said, there was an excess of roughness and harshness; but better this than an excess of smoothness. A sermon may be adjusted, and harmonized, and polished into perfect tameness and insipidity; the whole moves off, in a gentle, uniform, mellifluous flow, which reaches and stirs nobody, and which nobody cares for. "The words of the wise are as

goads." Such should be a portion, at least, of the words of the preacher. He must, in a world so spiritually stupid and lazy as this, employ thoughts and words which now and then will prick men: and men must be thankful for the spear, and be docile when it touches them, and never retaliate and kick against the salutary goad.

Mr. Clark's person, voice, and entire manner were in perfect keeping with his style;—a large masculine frame; a voice harsh, strong, capable of great volume, though not very flexible; an action, for the most part, ungraceful, but significant and natural; a countenance bearing bold, strongly marked features, at every opening of which the waked and working passions would look intensely out; then, thoughts and sentences such as we find in these volumes coming forth;—all together gave the idea of huge, gigantic power. We were reminded often of some great ordnance, throwing terribly its heavy shots. Who could, who dared go into unconsciousness before such an engine?

Mr. Clark had an unusual power of impressing the memory. Perhaps in nothing do preachers differ more than in this. We hear one deliver a sermon, and are very well pleased with it. It is made up of substantial and important matter. We endeavor at the time to give earnest heed to the things which we hear, lest we should let them slip. But somehow, do all we can, they will slip; soon the whole is utterly gone, and all that we can say about it is, that at such a time, we heard such a minister preach a sermon. We hear another; we give no closer attention; we are in no better mood. But the sermon inheres; parts of it, at least, are lodged within us too deeply and firmly to be thrown out by the rudest jostlings of amusement or business. Mr. Clark had this prime excellence of preaching to an unusual degree. Those who listened to his preaching, a score of years back, find that they can remember a great deal that he said. They retain, doubtless, clear conceptions of entire discourses, which on their delivery ploughed deeply into their minds. The power of condensed, graphic enunciation, by which light, strength and beauty were combined and concentrated, in part enabled Mr. Clark to sink these fixtures in the memory. The power of moral painting, also of graphic presentation, which has been referred to, did much to give the adhesiveness in question. The truth, which we are made to see, we cannot forget, as we do the truth we only hear.

The value of this power upon the memory in a preacher is not soon estimated. It helps him to insert the good seed beneath the surface, where the birds will not eat it up, nor the winds blow it away. Truth so inserted will often rise up and be thought of; conscience will reiterate the sermon in far future years. The Spirit may give it power; so that it shall result in the conversion of the soul, after the voice, that originally preached it, shall be still in death.

Mr. Clark frequently exhibited in his preaching the ability to make very strong religious impressions. His sermons were not in the strict sense revival sermons. They were never vaguely, loosely declamatory. There were no tricks of eloquence, no play upon the passions. There was, perhaps, too much sentiment, too much solid, searching truth in them for the greatest immediate movement and effect. His were not the right sort of loading and aim to do the most execution in a flock. His preaching was adapted rather to impress deeply a few minds than more slightly many minds. He did not operate upon the surface; he struck heavy and shook the very foundations of the character.

It is sometimes said of a preacher that there is a great deal of Christ in his sermons. This is deemed, and it is, a high commendation. It was a commendatory trait in Mr. Clark's preaching, that there was a great deal of God in it. We think, as we have said, that his exhibition of the divine character, at times, was not sufficiently mitigated. Still there is often placed before us, God, the great Sovereign and Agent, the subduer or the punisher of his foes, the unfailing protector of his people and his cause. God in his awful glory and purity, man in the moral baseness of his character,—in the black and stormy elements of his depravity,—were placed clearly and terribly side by side. The effect produced was, in some instances, awful and overwhelming. Says one, formerly a hearer of Mr. Clark, now a preacher of the same gospel: "While he was preaching on the text, 'Behold, thou hast spoken and done evil things as thou couldst,' such was the view of depravity which he gave, and such was the sense I had of my own native depravity, that a faintness came over me, and I verily believe, but for the hope I had in the atonement of Jesus, I should have sunk to the floor." A lady remarked, that "at one time his eloquence had such an overpowering effect upon her, that she felt afraid she should die if he proceeded farther." Others speak of the

same sort of impression. The effect on the mass, we think, would have been more immediate and benign, had there been some abatement of the awful and the irritating. As it was, the work done was thorough, and by no means inconsiderable in extent. Mr. Clark's preaching searched and incited the true disciple, pressing him up to a higher standard; it agitated and cut down the sinner, convincing him that there was no help in himself; it stripped and laid bare the hypocrite, bringing to his own view his own ugliness. Many of all classes, we doubt not, were persuaded by him to flee for refuge to lay hold upon the hope set before them, some of whom are now amid the conflicts of time, others amid the glories of eternity.

Subordinate to the spiritual results, and quite inferior in worth, yet highly valuable, was another effect of Mr. Clark's preaching. It wrought powerfully upon the intellect. It waked up the mind and set it to work. It was bracing; it made the hearer feel stronger than he felt before; he went out ready for achievement. We happen to be acquainted with those who acknowledge an indebtedness to Mr. Clark, in this respect, beyond what they owe to any other living mind, they ever came in contact with. They met him in their vernal and forming period. He interested them, he seized them, and bore them forward in a quickened and more robust growth. It is always, in some respects, an original and ascendent mind, that thus stimulates, and moulds, and makes stronger, other minds.

Mr. Clark's printed sermons have much of the same power. They read well; and when read once, they are apt to create an interest, which brings the individual back to read them again. This is a test of their excellence; they bear repeated readings. Some sermons lose almost every thing when separated from the living voice and manner. These preserve to a high degree their freshness and raciness in type. We love to recur to them, and feel that we are stirred and benefited by the perusal.

These sermons are fitted to exert a wholesome influence upon the pulpit; we deem them good sermons for preachers to have intercourse with. While they are not to be regarded altogether as models, they will aid ministers in advancing the style and strength of their own sermons. If any have fallen into a miserable, mincing way of writing or speaking, let them read these sermons. If any have come so under the dominion of false or excessive taste, that they cannot say a thing out, clear, strong and straight, let them read these sermons. If any are affected with languor

and tameness, as they stand in the pulpit, and afflict their hearers with the same oppressive qualities, let them read these sermons. If any are given to exquisitely fine spinning, or extravagantly high soaring, more in love with the sublimated than the sublunary, let them take in hand these coarser, rougher and weightier productions. They will do good by their astringency and their impulsiveness. They will help to make closer, warmer, manlier preaching. We trust the friends of Mr. Clark will continue to perpetuate his works in a convenient form, and an important service will be rendered thereby to the cause of truth and of God.

ARTICLE III.

PSYCHO-PHYSIOLOGY, VIEWED IN ITS CONNECTION WITH THE RELIGIOUS EMOTIONS.

By Samuel Adams, M. D. Prof. of Chemistry, etc., Illinois College, Jacksonville, Illinois.

IN a previous article,* we attempted to give a brief sketch of the connection between the body and the mind, and to classify and explain some of the phenomena, that result from that mysterious union. After a brief explanation of the laws of psychophysiological sympathy, we dwelt principally upon the action of the mind upon the body; and we noticed more particularly the influence of certain mental states, in disordering or suspending the action of the organs of sense. We beg leave to refer the reader to the above-named article, for the principles there laid down and illustrated, while we proceed to unfold, somewhat more fully than was there done, the connection of the mind with muscular action, and to make a direct application of our principles to the subject of the religious emotions. But while we shall principally restrict our inquiries to the relations of the religious emotions to the bodily functions, we shall be free to adduce parallel illustrations from the whole range of mental excitement; for we regard the religious emotions as peculiar only in the nature and magnitude of the objects which

* Biblical Repository, April, 1839, Vol. I. p. 362.

excite them, and in the solemnity of the occasions, on which they arise. They do not differ physiologically from the other emotions of the mind.

If, in the remarks that we shall make upon the topics that fall within our path, we should seem to any to deal roughly with subjects, which are endeared by hallowed associations to many pious minds, we beg leave to assure all such that we are actuated by no fault-finding disposition, by no secret pleasure in exposing the weaknesses of any sect or party. Far be it from us to cast any censure upon religious excitement as such, though it rise to the loftiest pitch of emotion, of which the human mind is capable. If there be any motives within the range of human contemplation, which ought to stir up the inmost depths of the soul, and rouse to action all its powers of feeling, surely religion furnishes those motives. We have no sympathy with those cold critics, who sneeringly characterize as "animal excitement" every degree of religious emotion, that does not flourish within the narrow polar circle of their own feelings. Depth and intensity of religious excitement are not to be complained of, so long as that excitement is characterized by a solemn grandeur, befitting the themes of religious contemplation.

There are, however, certain "bodily exercises," sometimes connected with religious excitements, which have been regarded by some, both as the evidences and the effects of the best and most powerful operations of the divine spirit. These phenomena we propose to examine, and to show that *some* of them at least *may* be derived from a less exalted source; that they *may* result from the action and reaction of the powers of the human constitution, without the intervention of any supernatural agency. And if this be true, they may be no more the result of divine agency, than the ordinary functions of the body. We shall not attempt to decide, in any particular instances which we may adduce, whether the phenomena in question are from above, or from beneath. We shall, however, endeavor to make it apparent, that the functions of the nervous system, embracing the operations of the mind, present a wide field for philosophical inquiry, which ought to be carefully surveyed, before we resort to miraculous power, for an explanation of this class of phenomena. We hope thus to suggest some cautions against attributing to the agency of the Holy Spirit effects, which may not do much honor to that heavenly messenger.

Before entering upon the direct object of our inquiries, we are to examine the connection of the mental operations with muscular action. It is scarcely necessary to refer to voluntary motion as a standing illustration of the influence of the mind over the muscles. Every voluntary movement of the body depends upon a direct physiological connection between the mind and the muscles. Sever this connection, and voluntary motion ceases. The will may issue its mandates, but the muscles are beyond the reach of its control. Thus the fact of a connection between the mind and the action of the muscles is established. But no reason can be given, *a priori*, why other mental states, as well as volition, may not give rise to muscular contraction, or why the peculiar condition of the muscles may not react upon the mind, so as to affect its operations. Both of these points, we propose briefly to examine.

In looking at the effects of the various mental operations upon the muscular system, the physiology of expression presents itself as a subject of peculiar interest. It is a fact, familiar to all, that the strong and lively emotions of the mind are accompanied by a natural expression, distinctly marking the character of each. Who does not know that the lights and shadows, that vary the aspect of the "human face divine," are but glimpses of the serenity and gloom that alternate within? Even the habitual states of the feelings are strongly marked in the countenance. So true is this, that an attempt to mask the real feelings under a forced expression is not entirely successful. Even the practised dissembler carries a mystery in his countenance, which, while it perplexes, awakens a suspicion of his real character. A few examples will illustrate this point.

A peculiar emotion of pleasure, acting through the brain and nerves upon the muscles of the face, imprints a smile upon the countenance. A stronger emotion, but similar in kind, not only affects the features, but throws the muscles of respiration into violent convulsions, giving rise to loud laughter. Grief is not limited in its expression to a simple effusion of tears; it acts upon the muscles more or less extensively, from a slight depression of the angles of the mouth, to an entire distortion of the features, and even convulses the respiratory muscles, causing sobbing and loud weeping. In the same manner we account for the elastic step and bounding pulse of overflowing joy, the clenched fist and compressed lip of stifled anger, the knitted brow of frowning wrath, the fixed eye and curled lip of

indignant scorn, the trembling and agitation of fear and terror.

The grace, dignity and ease, in the attitudes and gestures of an accomplished orator, are not so much the result of artificial rules, as the natural result of his own emotions. It is true, the rules of elocution are useful in correcting those habits and tendencies, which embarrass the free operation of psycho-physiological sympathy. But where the rules of elocution become the prominent characteristic of the style of oratory, where there is evidently a studied effort to apply these rules, the tendency is rather to prejudice than to win, rather to disgust than to please. He is the best orator who speaks without the embarrassment of a voluntary effort to apply the rules of his art, but yields himself freely to the spontaneous inspiration of his subject. Rules may assist in removing the impediments to a free operation of the sympathy between the body and the mind; but they can never create that sympathy; it is a part of the constitution with which man is endowed by his Creator. The ever-varying contour of the brow, the expressive glance, the fitful flashing of the eye, the playful turn of the lip, the changing attitudes of the whole frame, the harmonizing of all in one combined effect—these are not the offspring of art, but rise spontaneously from the emotions that, for the time, fill the mind of the orator.

But if the mind acts upon the muscles, why may not they, in their turn, react upon the mind so as to affect its states? This hypothesis is borne out by the analogies of the functions in health and disease, as well as by specific facts.

It is a law of our constitution, familiar to those who are conversant with the practice of medicine, that when two phenomena, either in the healthy or diseased states of the body, are connected together as cause and effect, or at least follow each other as antecedent and sequent, the order of antecedence and sequence is frequently reversed; so that sometimes one and sometimes the other is the first to show itself, or that which is ordinarily the antecedent may occasionally become the sequent. For example, the brain and liver are linked together by an intimate sympathy. Disease commencing in the brain is speedily followed by disorder of the liver. Disease commencing in the liver is followed by disorder of the functions of the brain. The same intimate sympathy exists between the brain and stomach, and any disorder in one speedily disturbs the functions of the other. Thus gloom and despondency are frequently the

consequence of indigestion ; indigestion is frequently caused by mental depression. Cheerfulness promotes healthy digestion ; healthy digestion promotes cheerfulness. It would not be difficult to multiply examples of this kind, all supporting an analogy which favors the supposition that, in the relations between the mind and the muscles, action and reaction are reciprocal ; that is, if the mind acts upon the muscles, the relation of causation may be reversed, so that the muscles may react upon the mind.

Sir David Brewster in discussing the subject of apparitions,* after speaking of the images of past perceptions, and spectral illusions, as existing in the mind's eye, goes on to remark : " I purpose . . . to show that the mind's eye is actually the body's eye, and that the retina is the common tablet, on which both classes of impressions are painted, and by means of which they receive their visual existence, according to the same optical laws." Although Sir David makes no distinction between a 'colored image painted upon the retina and the sentient state of that organ produced by such an image, we presume that nothing more is meant by him, than that the retina is in the same state of functional activity, when the mind is occupied in the contemplation of some spectre, or recollected image of past perceptions, as when it is actually observing an external object, whose image is really depicted upon the retina. We are disposed to take up this hint, and construct upon it the hypothesis, that, whenever any part of the nervous system is, by any cause, thrown into a state of functional activity, all the other parts, which co-operate in the same function, will be brought into a corresponding state of activity. Thus, an excited imagination or some morbid agent may act upon that part of the brain, which belongs to the apparatus of vision ; the optic nerve and retina will be simultaneously brought into a corresponding state, giving rise to a spectral illusion. Again, let the optic nerve or retina be brought into a morbid state, the brain will at once respond, and spectres, *muscæ volitantes*, etc., will be the result. Suppose now the muscles of expression, by an act of the will or any other cause, to be brought into action, the nerves connected with these muscles will partake of the new condition, and propagate a corresponding state to the brain ; the mind, sympathizing with the brain, will enter into a corresponding state of emotion.

* See Letters on Natural Magic, Letter III.

Mental exhilaration is known to give a sort of elastic energy to the action of the muscles ; nor is it less certain, that muscular action exhilarates the mind. The application of our hypothesis to this last case is obvious ; its truth is rendered highly probable by the quick sympathy, which is known to exist between all parts of the nervous system, especially those which are united in the performance of the same function, by the records of pathology, and by its ready application to the explanation of psycho-physiological phenomena.

Burke has some observations that bear upon this point, in his *Treatise on the Sublime and Beautiful*. He remarks (Part IV. § 3.): "It appears very clearly to me, that when the body is disposed, by any means whatsoever, to such emotions as it would acquire by the means of a certain passion, it will of itself excite something very like that passion in the mind." He goes on in the next section to illustrate the same point by reference to an account, given by Spon, of the celebrated physiognomist, Campanella. He thus speaks of him: "This man, it seems, had not only made very accurate observations on human faces, but was very expert in mimicking such as were in any way remarkable. When he had a mind to penetrate into the inclinations of those he had to deal with, he composed his face, his gesture and his whole body, as nearly as he could, into the exact similitude of the person he intended to examine ; and then carefully observe what turn of mind he seemed to acquire by the change ; "so that," says my author, "he was able to enter into the dispositions and thoughts of people as effectually, as if he had been changed into the very men." Without giving full credence to the statements here made with regard to the powers of Campanella,* we seem to be legitimately led to the conclusion, that the varying states of the muscles of expression produce a corresponding variation in the states of the mind.

Burke proceeds to remark on this point: "I have often observed that in mimicking the looks and gestures of angry, or placid, or frightened, or daring men, I have involuntarily found my mind turned to that passion whose appearance I endeavored to imitate ; nay, I am convinced it is hard to avoid it, though one strove to separate the passion from its corresponding ges-

* For some interesting remarks upon this singular individual, see Dugald Stewart's chapter on Sympathetic Imitation, Note A.

tures." We are persuaded that any one, who will repeat the experiments of Burke, will be convinced of the correctness of his observations. Let him, for example, by a voluntary effort, work the features into a smile; or, what is the same thing, let him bring the muscles of his face into a given state of contraction, and he will be immediately conscious of that agreeable mental emotion, which ordinarily corresponds to that position of the features. Again, let any one voluntarily express in his countenance a frown, and he will perceive, that the tone of the mind simultaneously assumes a corresponding sternness and severity.

There are other facts, which tend strongly to confirm the view we are taking of the effects of muscular action upon the states of the mind. We presume none will be disposed to deny that laughter, excited by tickling, is accompanied by the same hilarity of mind, that attends laughter on ordinary occasions. Now only two explanations can be given of this phenomenon. It may be said that the external impression produces a state of mind similar to that which ordinarily gives rise to laughter, and that consequently laughter ensues, as if the mental state had resulted from any other cause. Or it may be explained by saying, that the titillation acts directly upon the muscles of expression and respiration, and that the state of the mind results from the violent agitation of these muscles. In favor of the last explanation it may be said, that it accords well with the analogy of other cases in which the natural expression of an emotion becomes the cause which excites it. Besides, though the emotion attendant upon laughter is allied to pleasure, yet the sensation caused by tickling is decidedly disagreeable. It is anticipated with dread, and experienced with dislike. Thus, to make the sensation produced by tickling the direct cause of the attendant hilarity of mind, is to make it, at the same moment, the direct cause of two emotions, one of pleasure, and the other of pain. It is, therefore, difficult to account for this agreeable state of mind under circumstances decidedly painful, except by supposing that the muscular agitation, caused by the tickling, reacts so strongly upon the mind, as to impress upon it an agreeable emotion in opposition to the other disagreeable circumstances. The physiology (if we may be allowed the expression) of the government and control of the passions tends strongly to confirm our view of this subject. For example, by refraining from expressing a rising passion, the emotion is checked and

soon subsides. But let the muscles of expression yield to the impulse of passion, instead of submitting to the rational control of the will, and all is lost. One angry look, one passionate word opens at once the flood-gates of angry excitement, and the torrent flows forth unchecked; so true is it that "the *beginning* of strife is as when one letteth out water." But he who, under the influence of rising anger, can compose his countenance to a calm and placid expression, may say with authority to the surging elements of passion: "Peace, be still." There can be no doubt that in both these instances, the state of the muscles of expression reacts strongly upon the mind. In the first instance, by an angry expression, the passion is kindled into a ten-fold fury; in the second, a placid exterior, like a rock-bound barrier, resists and turns back the rushing torrent, that is struggling to pour itself forth with resistless power.

This point is illustrated by a change, which not unfrequently takes place in the temper of an individual by a change of circumstances. Let us suppose that a person has been trained to habits of self-government, and grown up in a community, where to disregard an insult, or overlook an injury is universally regarded as a mark of magnanimity. Let him change his residence, and attach himself to a community where the laws of honor require him to be quick to resent and prompt to chastise the most trifling insult or injury. At first, he does not find his feelings in harmony with things around him. But, yielding to the force of circumstances, he feels himself obliged sometimes to make at least a show of resentment, in order to sustain his character as a man of honor. This mere show of resentment, which at first does violence to old habits and feelings, will speedily stir up the combustible elements of his nature, and kindle in his breast a passion, which is liable to be roused to a flame by every breeze of circumstance. The same view is sustained by facts connected with the moral treatment of the insane. There is a species of insanity characterized by the most wild and frantic ravings. A successful mode of treating this frightful symptom is to encourage the patient to resist the impulse of madness, by a voluntary effort to preserve his calmness and composure, and by refraining from any expression of the passion by which he is agitated.

A rational view of the relation between the will and the emotions confirms us in the views we are taking on this point. What then is the relation of the will to the whole class of the

emotive states of the mind ? Does the will produce them by direct action ? Does desire spring up in obedience to volition, as the hand rises to the head ? Can a man suddenly reverse the whole current of his feelings by a mere act of the will, as he could turn on his heel ? It is too obvious to require argument, that the emotions, the desires, the passions, the affections are not voluntary states of the mind. They all spring from causes without the mind ; desire is excited in view of some object ; passion has its exterior exciting cause. No effort of the will can call into exercise the affections without directing the mind to their proper objects. And yet, every well balanced mind feels that the desires and the passions are not entirely free from the wholesome discipline of the will. To suppose otherwise is to reduce the mind to a humiliating bondage to matter, to render man the slave of desire, the sport of passion. A simple appeal to consciousness is sufficient to convince any one, that, though the will cannot directly excite or check the passions or the affections, it does still possess some kind of prompting and controlling power over them. If then this prompting and controlling power be not direct in its action, it must be traced to the empire which the will exercises over the muscles of expression, and the reaction of those muscles upon the states of the mind. We may add under this head the power which the mind has of choosing its objects of attention, and thus, by that choice, of determining the character of its emotive states.

Let us now suppose an individual under the influence of some turbulent and exciting passion, which glares out in the expression of the countenance, and shows itself in corresponding gestures and attitudes of the body. How can this passion be controlled ? It may be *checked* by an effort of the will to calm the muscular agitation, and assume an opposite expression of countenance ; it may be *supplanted* by directing the mind to objects and views which are tranquilizing in their influence. Let it not be supposed in this case that the voluntary state of the muscles of expression has no influence in controlling the passion. It would be impossible to turn the attention to new objects, while the mind is raging with excited passion. The muscular reaction, then, is necessary to quell the insurrection that has broken out among the faculties of the soul, before they can be brought to listen to the salutary voice of reason and conscience. But let us suppose that some state of the affections, which the mind does not enjoy, is desirable. How shall it ar-

rive at that enjoyment? This question is best answered by an example. A person has acquired a habit of looking at things through a false and gloomy medium. His countenance is habitually clouded with gloom and despondency; his heart is corroded with the gnawings of envy and misanthropy. How shall he come to the enjoyment of that happiness, which flows from a more kindly estimate of his fellow-men? Let him, by a voluntary effort, light up in his countenance the smile of cheerfulness. This state of the features, by its reaction upon the brain, disposes the mind to more happy emotions. Then let the thoughts be steadily turned to those objects, and to those views of Providence, which tend to tranquilize the soul, and shed upon its darkness the light of joy and hope.

We are persuaded that a few experiments will convince any one of the correctness of the views we are presenting. Let one try to feel cheerful, with an expression of gloom on his countenance, or to feel gloomy, while a smile is playing on his features; and he will be convinced that the only way to change the current of the feelings is to lead the way by the expression of the countenance. He will also find, that a vacant indifference of expression is incompatible with any considerable movement of the emotions. In a voluntary effort to call up an emotion, by assuming its expression, something like the following phenomena seem to be observable. 1. The mind is thrown into a state corresponding to the external expression. 2. The imagination is simultaneously roused to action, and seems struggling to call up some object or image, suited to sustain the emotion, which has been forced, as it were, upon the mind. 3. If the imagination speedily seizes upon some object calculated to perpetuate the given emotion, the countenance continues settled and expressive, and the emotion acquires a certain degree of steadiness and permanency. 4. But if, on the contrary, the imagination fails to call up an object suited to give permanency to the mental state, the result will differ according to the nature and strength of the emotion. If the emotion expressed be a placid one, and no object or image spring up before the mind to sustain it, the expression of the countenance will soon subside into vacancy, and the mental emotion into momentary fatuity. But if the passion expressed be strong and turbulent in its character, and its expression require a strong muscular effort, without any object before the mind to preserve its equilibrium, the countenance becomes discomposed and expres-

sive of an unnatural frenzy, and the mind runs wild into a momentary delirious excitement.

If the views which we have presented be correct, it is evident that no passion or emotion of the mind can be voluntarily called up without assuming its expression ; and that when the countenance is made to express a passion, and thus to awaken it in the mind, no healthy emotion can be kept up, without having before the mind the appropriate exciting object. We see, then, the folly of those public speakers, who depend more, on public occasions, upon their own voluntary efforts to excite their emotions, than upon the spontaneous inspiration of the subject they discuss.

Thus far, in discussing the effects of muscular action upon the mental states, we have limited our inquiries to the muscles of expression. But nothing can be more evident, than that muscular action, which has no connection with the physiology of expression, is capable of powerfully modifying the operations of the mind. The following experiment is a satisfactory illustration of this proposition, as well as a proof of its truth. When an individual finds the action of his mind growing languid and sluggish, and experiences a difficulty in mental exertion, let him suddenly throw all the muscles of the body into a state of strong tension, and every faculty of the mind will receive a momentary impulse, and all its actions will be quickened. Nothing is more common than for a person to rouse himself from a state of mental lethargy, by vigorous muscular exertion. There can be no doubt that those public speakers, whose principle characteristics are strength of voice, and a sort of grotesque violence of gesture, do, by their muscular exertions, engender in themselves a corresponding wildness of mental excitement.

We wish not to be understood, in the above discussion, as pretending to be able, in all instances, to trace out with certainty the exact relations between cause and effect. We only claim to be able, in a series of psycho-physiological phenomena, to point out, with a high degree of probability, the first link in the chain of connection by which they are bound together. Whenever the mind acts upon the body, a corresponding state is produced in the latter, which in its turn reacts upon the mind ; and thus it is by a sort of reflex sympathy or reciprocal action of body and mind, that the effect rises to its maximum ; so that it would be hardly philosophical to refer the ultimate result to

the first link in the chain of causation, without taking into consideration the intermediate connection. The same is true when a peculiar state of the body acts upon the mind. It is also important to remark that the effects depend very much upon the constitution of the individual, being the most intense in those of a highly nervous temperament.

Those, who have treated of the action of the mind upon the functions of the body, have generally done so under the heads of imagination and sympathy. To these we propose to add another, *overstrained or perverted action of the will*. Hope or fear, or any other strong emotion may concur with either or all of the above causes, in disturbing the nervous functions. By the *overstrained* action of the will, we mean a high-wrought and prolonged voluntary effort to produce or perpetuate a given state of the body or mind. By the *perverted* action of the will, we mean the same kind of effort to force the will out of its proper sphere, or to exercise over the functions of the body or operations of the mind a control which does not fall within the province of the legitimate power of the will.

As an illustration of the *overstrained* action of the will, we may mention the intense and prolonged effort, sometimes made by a patient under a painful surgical operation, to preserve a fixed and motionless posture of the body, and to refrain from exhibiting any signs of distress. Such an effort is frequently followed by a dangerous collapse of the vital powers, leading to a fatal termination of an operation by no means dangerous; so that the most skilful surgeons encourage their patients, while enduring a painful operation, to indulge freely any disposition they may have to give vent to cries and groans. The *perverted* action of the will is illustrated by the efforts, that persons sometimes make to subject themselves to the supposed influence of animal magnetism. For instances of this kind, see Biblical Repository, April, 1839, Vol. I. pp. 372, 379, etc. The writer of this article is acquainted with an individual of a nervous temperament, who brought on an attack of convulsions, by a prolonged voluntary effort to accelerate the functions of respiration, which seemed to him too slow and languid for the exigencies of health. A similar case, which fell under the observation of the writer, was attended with considerable disturbance of the nervous system.

In the light of the facts, and principles, which we have passed in review, let us turn our attention to *religious excitement*,

and the physical phenomena that sometimes attend it. Let us notice how these "bodily exercises" may originate in the peculiar temperament, or character of religious teachers.

Let us suppose, in the first place, that the preacher possesses all the qualifications that can be expected in a chosen minister of Christ,—a sober and rational piety, a deep experimental knowledge of the mysteries of religion, a thorough insight into human character, and the motives from which human actions spring, an extent of learning which enables him to draw materials for his work from every field of nature and from every walk of science and art; and let us suppose that all these qualifications are enlivened and sanctified by a strong and ardent desire for the salvation of souls. With such an individual before our minds, it would not be difficult to anticipate the character of his preaching and the nature of the effects produced by it. He would come before his audience, imbued with a thorough knowledge of his subject, and with a clear comprehension of its relations and bearings, and a deep sense of the wants of those he is to address; confident, not in his own strength, but in him who has said: "My grace is sufficient for thee." The preacher would become excited; but not by the reflex action of his own will, chafing and irritating his nervous system. His excitement would be deep and solemn, springing from the inspiration of his subject, and from circumstances around him. His hearers would become excited; but not by a wild sympathy with a frantic raver. Their excitement would be characterized by a deep solemnity, arising from a presentation of lofty and thrilling views of truth, and would be very unlikely to be attended by jerks and spasms, trances and swoons.

Let us now contemplate a preacher of a different character,—one possessing but few of the qualifications which we have supposed to belong to the minister of Christ, who is thoroughly furnished for his work. His whole power over his hearers consists in exciting the feelings, without enlightening and convincing the intellect; and his ability to excite the feelings consists in becoming excited himself, and thus communicating the contagion by sympathy. Such a minister is not likely to be very laborious in preparing for his public ministrations. He overlooks the fact that there can be no healthy excitement of the emotions, without a clear intellectual conception of those objects and truths which naturally produce them. Hence his main object, when he comes before his audience, is to work himself up into

a frenzy of excitement. But, inspired by no lofty sentiments, having before his mind no glowing views of truth to enliven his emotions, he attempts to do it by mere dint of volition. In other words, he makes a huge, voluntary effort to *feel*. His muscular system is thus thrown into a state of violent tension; his voice becomes strained and unnatural; his gestures forced and violent; his eye and countenance wild and discomposed. Such a speaker could not fail to make a strong impression upon any nervous individual, who might be sitting within the glance of his eye and sound of his voice. But soon the torrent of excitement, becoming swelled by the sympathy of numbers, would be irresistible, bearing down every thing in its course, producing "bodily exercises" of various kinds and degrees, according to the nervous susceptibilities of different individuals.

We need not say how little exercise of the intellect, or of healthy emotion, there would be in all this excitement. We read of a German fanatic who drew together vast crowds, and produced immense excitement wherever he went, though he preached in Latin, a language which not one in a thousand of his hearers understood. His strained and unnatural voice, his frantic countenance and wild gesticulation, without one intelligible idea, kindled and spread the flame of excitement wherever he appeared.*

We have seen that to assume the expression of any passion or emotion, and to attempt to prolong that expression, without bringing up before the imagination some exciting object of the emotion, is to throw the mind into a whirl of delirious excitement. We have also seen that the over-strained and perverted action of the will may produce very marked effects upon the functions of the body. It is easy to see, in the light of these two principles, that our preacher's voluntary effort to *feel intensely* could have had no very desirable effect upon the functions of his body or operations of his mind.

But it may be said, that we have not yet accounted for those agitations of body, those trances and swoons, that have sometimes occurred in the secret retirement of the closet, and in the midst of the solemn stillness of the Quaker meeting. This leads us, in the second place, to bring out a little more prominently, than we have yet done in this article, a *false principle* and *mistaken practice* which prevail extensively in religious devo-

* See Dictionnaire des Sciences Médicales, Article, Voix.

tions, both public and private, and is the fruitful source of many physical phenomena, which are not well explained in those works which treat of the influence of the imagination and sympathy over the functions of the body. The *false principle*, to which we allude, is the belief that the religious affections may be called into exercise by a direct effort of the will to rouse them to action. The *mistaken practice* is the perverted and over-strained action of the will, in which individuals endeavor to engender directly, by a voluntary effort, that affection or emotion which, in any case, may seem desirable.

That this is a false principle and mistaken practice will be at once allowed by all, who admit the justness of our remarks upon the connection of the will with the emotive states of the mind. We need only appeal to common sense to show, that to exercise right affections towards God, without a clear conception of his attributes and character, is an absurdity, an impossibility. Even if one supposes he loves and adores God, while he has no consistent view of his character and attributes, God is not the object of his affection, but a creature of his own imagination. The same absurdity is involved in an attempt to exercise right feelings towards our fellow-men, without a consistent view of their character and relations to us, and our common relation to God and a future destiny. Equally vain is it to think of feeling rightly towards ourselves, without knowing our own hearts and our relations to time and eternity. The will, it is true, can form a purpose to study the attributes of God; it may execute that purpose; and, by the blessing of God, a consistent view of his character thus obtained, may lead to right affections towards him. But to endeavor to love and adore God, without any consistent idea of him, would be more vain, than for a man, destitute of a spark of imagination, to endeavor, in the darkest midnight, to thrill with emotions of beauty and sublimity in view of some splendid landscape.

The first step, then, towards exercising right affections towards God, is to become acquainted with his character, as he has revealed it in his word, his works and his providence. Hence, one object in the plan of redemption, seems to have been, to draw forth the affections of God's rational offspring towards him, by presenting his character in a more interesting light, than any in which it had yet appeared before the world.

In order to understand more clearly the operation of the *false principle* to which we have alluded, let us examine the subject

a little more in detail. Let us suppose, first, that an individual has embraced the hypothesis that those bodies, usually called opaque, are only relatively so; that all material substances transmit some light, and that a sufficiently intense and prolonged effort of the will would enable us to discern objects through them. Now let us suppose that this dreamer attempts to carry his theory into practice. He seats himself opposite to a thick wall, strains to the utmost all his power of volition to look through it, and continues this effort for hours, and even days. Under these circumstances, his nervous system could not fail to lose its equilibrium, and fall into some variety of abnormal action; or its high-wrought tension would be followed by a collapse more or less marked. If, moreover, our experimenter believes that eternal consequences depend upon the success of his effort, the nervous system will be subjected to an additional disturbing influence. Again, let an individual be given to understand that he is under the influence of some mysterious agent, as animal magnetism,* and that certain effects will result from this agency, provided all the power of his will is exerted to procure the result. He endeavors to perform his part as instructed, and if he be "susceptible of the magnetic influence," he at length experiences the expected result in the form of spasms, a swoon, or magnetic sleep. Let us take another case. A person believes he can obtain a sensible communication with the Deity, by a sufficiently intense concentration of all the powers of the soul to that one point. He makes the effort, and at length falls into a trance, basks in the light of celestial glory, and enjoys social intercourse with God and the pure spirits of heaven.† In both these last instances, the perverted action of the will is aided in its influence on the nervous system, by the agency of a bewildered imagination. Let us now look into a religious meeting, where the preaching is one fervent and almost constant strain of exhortation, calling upon sinners to "repent and believe," to "submit to Christ," to "give their hearts to God," etc., exhorting Christians to "feel more," to "agonize in prayer." Now we ask, what must be the effect of such preaching? Could it fail to lead the hearers to believe, that what is required of them may be accomplished instantaneously, by a mere act of the will, and to stimulate them to nerve themselves

* See Biblical Repository, April, 1839, Vol. I. pp. 379, etc.

† Ibid. pp. 372, etc.

up to some mighty voluntary effort to comply with the exhortation? Can they do directly, by mere volition, what they are exhorted to do? We answer decidedly, No. If the question of human ability be, whether a man can, by a direct act of the will, instantaneously reverse the whole current of his feelings, and set them to flowing in the right direction, and in the right channels, we give our voice for the doctrine of human *inability*, both *natural* and *moral*.

But let us not be understood as advocating the ultra doctrine of human inability. Though a man, exposed to a chilling atmosphere, cannot feel warm by standing still, and merely *willing* to be warm, yet he *can* approach a fire, and expose himself to its action, and thus change the state of his sensations. A mere volition cannot engender the taste of sweet, nor any other savor; and yet every one, if he chooses, may enjoy those savors, by bringing the organs of taste in contact with the appropriate substances; provided the substances are within his reach. No one can maintain the healthy action of his bodily functions, by merely *willing* to do so, while he refuses to take his daily food; and yet every one can take that food, when it is within his reach. No more can man's moral sensibilities enjoy a healthy excitement, without exposing the mind to the action of the appropriate stimulants; and yet every one has power, by an act of choice, to bring the mind in contact with religious truth and objects of moral approbation. Neither can the soul enjoy moral health, without receiving the nutriment which has been provided for its sustenance. And how abundant is the provision! God has spread out a "feast of fat things," which is at all times accessible to every hungry soul; and whoever will may come and take of the water of life freely. Thus it will be seen, that the first step in human guilt is the wrong choice which the mind makes of its objects of attention. The heathen were regarded as guilty by the apostle, "because, when they knew God, they glorified him not as God." They *chose* to give their attention to the deformed offspring of their own vain imaginations, instead of attending to the character and claims of God. The Psalmist recognizes the principle that *attention* is needful, in order to come to right views of God and right affections towards him. "Whoso is wise, and will *observe* these things, even he shall understand the loving kindness of the Lord." It follows, moreover, from the above remarks, that the turning point of man's salvation, so far as it

depends on human agency, is the right choice which the mind makes of its future objects of attention, including the future course of moral action. This act of choice is the strong purpose of the soul, for all coming time, to know and act up to the claims of duty and its own high destiny. At this point the sinner first enters upon the path of duty, and his whole intellectual and moral nature begins to move in a new direction, and towards new objects. But let it be remarked, that this purpose of the mind is not a struggle of the will to call up emotion, but an intelligent decision upon a plan for future life. Hence, all that exhortation, which tends to push the mind up to a voluntary effort to *feel*, fails of the great object at which religious teaching should aim. The sinner must be brought *intelligently* to a decision of the great question, that his decision may be final. He must count the cost. In order that the purpose of a new life should be formed, the desirableness of the ends at which it aims must be felt, and the tendency of the new course of action to reach those ends must also be seen. Thus the very existence of the voluntary purpose implies an antecedent action of the intellect and the feelings, without which it could never have existed. Again, a purpose formed is of no avail unless executed; and a constant view of the objects in pursuit is necessary to insure its execution. Thus we see that the will is not the only faculty of the mind, which is to be addressed in leading sinners to repentance.

But let us return to the point from which we digressed. A sinner, ignorant of his own heart, ignorant of the character of God, is exhorted, in the manner which we have mentioned above, to repent, to give his heart to God, to submit to Christ. He understands these expressions to refer to a sudden, voluntary change in the state of his affections, and summons all the power of the will, and puts every faculty of soul and body upon the stretch, in the mighty effort which he makes to repent. He repeats the effort again and again, without success. He truly attempts to "take a leap in the dark," but is arrested and thrown back by an impenetrable wall that meets him on every side. For how can one believe on him of whom he has not heard? Or how can he believe on him, of whom he has not *learned*, though he may have heard? Again, as the Christian is exhorted to feel more, to agonize in prayer, he nerves himself up to that effort, he throws his whole nervous and muscular systems into a state of the most violent tension, in his mighty struggle to

make his breast heave with emotion,—to strain out his vast desires to God in prayer. Yet the only effect is to make his emotions more turbulent, his desires more wild and unstable, by the chafing influence of the will upon the nerves.

But what must be the effects of such perverted and overstrained action of the will, on the nervous habits of those who indulge in it? Certainly they could not be very salutary. We might expect that such individuals would be subject to bodily agitations, trances and swoons, even in the retirement of their closets, much more in public assemblies.

But if we object to that mode of religious teaching, which is fraught with such results, we may be called upon to point out a more excellent way. We trust that a review of the religious experience of many devout Christians, will at once suggest the truth on this point. We doubt not that the following is the history of the experience of many Christians; we know it is of some. Through guilty neglect of the means of grace and knowledge, they have grown up ignorant of their own hearts and of the divine character; and, in the mean time, they have become confirmed in habits of sin. Yet the unsatisfied longings of their souls, and an instinctive dread of future retribution have rendered them uneasy; and they have fancied that the bliss for which they sigh can only be found in the Christian religion. Hence, when they have been again and again exhorted to give up the world, and embrace the Lord Jesus Christ, they have as often made a desperate voluntary effort to repent, and embrace the truth as it is in Jesus, and have as often failed. All this time the Bible is neglected, and with it all of those means which require any effort of the intellect, or which tend to lay open the moral corruption of the heart to the light of God's holy law. At length the individual concludes to take another way of seeking the kingdom of God and his righteousness. He enters upon the irksome task (as he has hitherto regarded it) of prayerfully studying the word of God, and listens as for his life to the preaching of the gospel. The mysteries of iniquity in his own heart are revealed to him. He recognizes the justice of God's requirements, and his own guilt, and just condemnation. He is now brought into a position to feel the burden of his sins and his need of a Saviour,—the only state of mind, in which he can understand the character of Christ, as "the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world," and consequently the only state of mind in which he can embrace Christ

in that character. It should then be the object of the preacher to lead sinners to that state of mind, and then to portray to them the character of Christ, as the Redeemer, the atoning sacrifice, the Saviour whom they need, and invite them to accept him as such.

We repeat it, repentance towards God, and faith in the Lord Jesus Christ do not result from any spasmodic efforts of the will, however intense, and however often repeated, but from the blessing of God upon a clear and candid intellectual and moral view of the facts in the case, and a rational course of action based upon that view. Let the sinner then be induced, by appeals to reason and conscience, to exert his powers within some sphere of voluntary action. Let him go to the word of God, and solemnly examine his own character and conduct in the light of that word; let him contemplate his relations to God and the duties that grow out of these relations; let him study the divine character as exhibited in his word, his works and his providence; and let him obey the suggestions of conscience, and the divine Spirit, which would most assuredly attend a candid and solemn inquiry for the path of duty, and surely the blessing of God will rest upon his efforts, and crown them with the forgiveness of his sins and a good hope in Christ. "For every one that seeketh, findeth, and to him that knocketh, it shall be opened."

We shall close this article by reviewing some instances of religious excitement, which have been attended with disorder of the bodily functions. We shall notice only a few cases, which will serve as specimens of the whole class; and leave the reader to make his own application of the principles, which we have developed, to any other facts which may be within his knowledge.

Most who are acquainted with the religious history of our country, know something of the great revival of Kentucky, which was at its height about the year 1801. It is well known that this revival was characterized by very extraordinary bodily affections, consisting of an entire prostration of the physical frame, or of the most violent spasmodic action of the muscles, such as involuntary leaping, jerking and convulsions.* It is not difficult to explain these phenomena in a general way, by referring them to the intense religious excitement, which is known

* New-York Evangelist, Dec. 14, 1839.

to have prevailed at that time. Nor does it affect the correctness of this explanation, whether the excitement resulted from the influence of the Holy Spirit and the healthy operation of truth upon the mind, or was the offspring of a heated imagination and disordered sympathy. Intense and prolonged excitement will produce such effects, however it may originate. But the accounts of this revival, which we have read, do not enable us to decide definitely, whether the perverted or over-strained action of the will had any thing to do with originating the physical phenomena; yet some incidental remarks lead us to believe, that this must be taken into consideration in accounting for the effects.

It is a circumstance worthy of remark in this revival, that scoffers and blasphemers were seized with the spasmodic affections, as well as the penitent and believing; while, as the eccentric Lorenzo Dow remarks,* "those naturalists, who wished and tried to get the affection in order to philosophize upon it," were not affected by it. Thus those who entered into the magic circle of excitement, whether in opposing or favoring the movement, were the subjects of the nervous spasms, while the calm and tranquil were unaffected.

The Rev. Dr. Baxter, late President of the Union Theological Seminary, Virginia, who visited the scene of excitement, remarks: "Persons who fall are generally such as have manifested symptoms of the deepest impressions, for some time previous to the event." It can hardly be doubted that the persons spoken of, while under the influence of deep religious impressions, in the midst of such moving scenes, would be led to make intense and repeated efforts of the will, to throw off the burden that oppressed them, and to force their way through the impenetrable wall that seemed to obstruct their entrance into the regions of light and joy. We have seen that such efforts must prove unavailing for the attainment of the desired end, and must tend powerfully to subvert the healthy action of the nervous system. So also with reference to scoffers and opposers, the constant tension in which they kept the nervous and muscular systems, by efforts to brace up against the influence which they hated and feared, would strongly co-operate with their excited emotions to hasten the crisis which they dreaded.

* Essay upon the Influence of the Imagination on the Nervous System, by Rev. Grant Powers.

The Rev. John Wesley, in his "Journal," and in his "Short Account of those People, called Methodists," mentions phenomena similar to those of the Kentucky revival, as occurring under his own ministration and that of his immediate associates. We shall quote only one instance from his Journal of June 15, 1739. We select this instance, not because it is more striking than a multitude of others, which might be chosen, but because the circumstances are detailed which enable us to form a fair judgment of the case. Mr. Wesley arrives at Wapping in the evening, "weary in body and faint in spirit." Before rising to preach, he finds that his ideas have failed him on the text upon which he had designed to speak. He opens the Bible for a text, and his eyes fall upon Hebrews 10: 19, and he discourses from that passage. He remarks: "While I was *earnestly inviting* all sinners to enter into the holiest by this new and living way, many of those who heard began to call upon God with strong cries and tears. Some sunk down, and there remained no strength in them; others exceedingly trembled and quaked; some were torn with a kind of convulsive motion in every part of their bodies, and that so violently, that four or five persons could not hold one of them." It seems that in this case, one raving opposer fell into the spasms with the rest.

We shall not deny, in this case, that the mental excitement, which caused the prostration of strength and the convulsions, might have resulted from the operation of truth and the Spirit of God upon the mind. But we wish to suggest the inquiry, whether this *earnest invitation*, "to enter into the holiest by the new and living way," would not naturally have stimulated some to put forth those abnormal voluntary efforts, which we have characterized as an over-strained and perverted action of the will, and which, as we have clearly shown, tend directly to produce the phenomena above described? Until this question is fairly answered, no one can, with any justice, ascribe the effects to the especial influence of the Holy Spirit.

President Edwards, in his account of the revivals which occurred in New-England between the years 1734 and 1744, speaks of "extraordinary views of divine things, and religious affections, being frequently attended with very great effects on the body, nature often sinking under the weight of divine discoveries, the strength of the body taken away, so as to deprive of all ability to stand or speak; sometimes the hands clenched, and the flesh cold, but senses still remaining; animal nature

often in a great emotion and agitation, and the soul very often, of late, so overcome with great admiration, and a kind of omnipotent joy, as to cause the person (wholly unavoidably) to leap with all the might, with joy and mighty exultation of soul."

President Edwards, in remarking upon "these effects on the body," says, they "did not begin now at this wonderful season, that they should be owing to the influence of the example of the times, but about seven years ago; and began in a much higher degree and greater frequency, near three years ago, when there was no such enthusiastical season, as many account this; but it was a very dead time through the land; they arose from no distemper caught from Mr. Whitefield or Mr. Tennant, because they began before either of them came into the country; they began, as I said, near three years ago, in a great increase, upon an extraordinary *self-dedication*, and *renunciation* of the world, and *resignation* of all to God;... and began in a yet higher degree and greater frequency, about a year and a half ago, upon another new *resignation* of all to God;... and began in a much higher degree still, the last winter, upon another *resignation* and acceptance of God, as the only portion and happiness of the soul."

We wish to direct particular attention to the words, which we have italicized above; for they are highly important in analyzing the phenomena in question. Let us turn our attention to the "dead time through the land," mentioned in the quotation above; and let us inquire also by what probable instrumentality the "*self-dedication*," "*renunciation* of the world," and "*resignation* of all to God," which succeeded, were brought about. It would not be very unnatural to suppose, that some of the faithful ministers of Christ, witnessing the low state of religion in the land, and becoming deeply sensible of the importance of rousing the church from its lethargy, "should give all their energies" to such an effort. We should expect to hear, under such circumstances, fervent exhortations to Christians to *dedicate* themselves anew to Christ, to *renounce* the world and all its vanities, and to *resign* all to God, and to do it immediately. Now if President Edwards had represented himself and others as actually having addressed such exhortations to the churches, no one would be able to detect any want of verisimilitude in his statements. They would perfectly accord with what any one may observe in the religious movements of the present

day. Indeed, he does admit, in speaking of addresses to the understanding, that "it is very probable, that these things have been of late too much neglected by many ministers;" and we think he more than hints at the existence of injudicious exhorting. Besides, the view, which President Edwards takes of the relation of the will to the affections, would be likely to lead to errors in practice. He says, in the work quoted above, page 122: "All acts of the affections of the soul are, in some sense, acts of the will, and all acts of the will are acts of the affections." Now if affections are voluntary acts, it is as proper to exhort men to feel, as to act, for it is the same thing.

Now we shall not undertake to condemn the kind of exhortation, which we have characterized above; but we must express our conviction, that unless carefully guarded, it could not fail to lead some into error. Feeling, as they naturally would, that this "self-dedication," "renunciation of the world," "resignation of all to God," consisted in a state of the affections, they would understand themselves called upon by their ministers to enter at once into that state, by putting forth some mighty voluntary effort. Such efforts would be nothing more nor less than an over-strained and perverted action of the will, tending to chafe the nervous system, and bringing it into an irritable state, well fitted to exhibit the phenomena described by President Edwards. And even where there is no tendency in religious teaching to lead the mind astray on this point, such is the perversity of human character, that man is ever prone to leave the plain path, which would conduct him to a knowledge of the truth, and to strain his voluntary powers to seize some gaudy phantom of his own imagination. Hence, in most revivals of religion, there is a tendency to disturbance of the nervous functions, arising from mistaken efforts of those under conviction of sin, to produce in the soul by mere dint of volition, a change which can alone be effected by the operation of truth and the Spirit of God.

Mr. Barclay,* in his apology for the Quakers, in speaking of the beneficial effects of their silent meetings, says: "Sometimes the power of God will break forth into a whole meeting, and there will be such an inward *travail*, while each is *seeking* to *overcome* the evil in themselves, that by the strong working of

* Works of Dugald Stewart, chapter on Sympathetic Imitation.

these opposite powers, (the evil and the good,) like the going of two contrary tides, every individual will be strongly exercised as in a day of battle, and thereby trembling and a motion of the body will be upon most, if not all of them."

It is difficult to attach any intelligible idea to the phrase, "inward travail, while each is seeking to overcome the evil in themselves," unless Mr. Barclay has characterized by it that vague and indefinite straining of the will, to which we have often alluded in this article. And surely it is philosophical to expect the same effects upon the body, from this strong reaction of the will upon the nervous system, whether it consists in straining to produce in one's self the effects of animal magnetism, to penetrate the veil which hides from mortal sight the presence-chamber of the Most High, to engender holy emotions in the soul, or to overcome the evil within.

We may have overrated the extent of the habit of overtasking the will, and trying to force it out of its proper sphere of action, in religious exercises; but we are strongly convinced that the evil is much more extensive than is generally supposed. If then it be admitted, that this mode of chafing and irritating the nervous system prevails somewhat extensively in the religious world, it would be natural to ascribe to it some of those minor effects upon the body, which do not go to the extent of entire prostration and general convulsions. We apprehend that it would not be difficult to distinguish the man, who is in the habit of calling in the efforts of the will to give intensity to his desires and emotions, while engaged in the exercise of public prayer. We observe the convulsive clenching of the fist or clasping of the hands, the distortion and twitching of the features, the hurried and convulsive respiration, the over-strained voice, an occasional shudder pervading the whole frame, as if caused by a sudden thrill. The same phenomena, though in a less degree, may be observed in those who silently join in public prayer, and endeavor to second every petition that is offered by all the intensity of volition they can call into exercise. In this latter case the voluntary effort, by partially suppressing the respiration, produces a feeling of distress in the region of the præcordia, which is very naturally and very *frequently* relieved by a groan.

The habit of trying to stimulate the desires and emotions, by the direct action of the will, cannot fail to render the nervous system highly irritable, its functions fluctuating and unstable,

and strongly to predispose the constitution to all kinds of anomalous nervous affections. But there are evils attendant upon this habit which are more serious than those which affect the physical constitution; we mean, the unbalancing of man's moral nature, by leading to distorted views of human inability. We have already alluded to the proneness of man to try to comply with the claims of duty, by voluntary efforts to engender feeling, when those claims require action. It is true that a course of obedient action always implies a corresponding state of the affections; and that state of the affections is frequently adduced in Scripture as a test of character. But then voluntary action is constantly appealed to as a test of the genuineness of the affection, and is the *experimentum crucis* by which hypocrisy is made to assume its own coloring. "If ye love me, *keep my commandments*." "Whoso *keepeth his word*, in him verily is the love of God perfected." The sinner, in thinking of returning to God, is constantly led by the tendencies of his depraved mind, and perhaps by erroneous instructions, to exert the power of the will, in trying to engender right affections in the soul. He repeats the effort again and again, and summons all the energies of body and mind to the mighty struggle. He at length learns, by bitter experience, the important truth, that the affections are not voluntary states of the mind, that the feelings and emotions do not rise and fall at the direct bidding of the will. But at the same time, he falls into an error fearfully dangerous in its consequences. From the failure of his efforts to *feel right*, he concludes he can do nothing to secure his own salvation. If fortunately, the individual is at last brought by the blessing of God to a knowledge of the truth as it is in Jesus, he soon forgets the plain path by which he has been led, while every circumstance connected with the sore struggle and bitter agonies, through which he passed, in trying by a direct effort of the will to change the state of his affections, is recollected with painful exactness, and dwelt upon with melancholy interest, as the sad proof of man's *entire inability*. His views are seized upon by the impenitent, and perverted to their own destruction. They conclude that their salvation depends upon an arbitrary fatality, and in no sense upon their own voluntary obedience; and they settle down to a hardened indifference to their own immortal interests. Or perhaps the sinner, often straining his faculties to the utmost to rectify his *feelings* by some instantaneous effort of the will, concludes at last that his case is hopeless, that his

doom is already sealed in the counsels of eternity, and dismisses all further concern or effort for his own salvation. Or, perchance, he comes to the still more fearful conclusion, that religion is a delusion, immortality but a dream of the imagination. Again, the sinner, by straining the will in the manner above described, unsettles the functions of the nervous system, and thus subjects himself to strange bodily sensations, spectral illusions, etc. And we apprehend the cases are not few, in which the mind, under such circumstances, seizes upon some thrilling sensation pervading the body, or some phantom of a disordered brain, as the evidence of acceptance with God, and rests satisfied with a false and delusive hope.

We have discussed the connection between the will and the emotive states of the mind at greater length, than we intended in commencing this article. But we could not well say upon that point what was necessary to the elucidation of the main subject of this discussion, without subjecting ourselves to the danger of misapprehension, unless we were more full and explicit than we had at first designed. On the other hand, to have answered every objection which might possibly arise in the mind of any, against the views which we have presented, would have been inconsistent with the main design of the discussion, and would have swelled this article to an immoderate length. We shall therefore hold ourselves in readiness to answer objections when they are offered, or to confess our errors when they are pointed out. We have expressed our views with freedom, but, we trust, candor. However our opinions may be regarded, we trust a candid public will accord to us the merit of calling attention to a subject of vital importance to the cause of truth and piety.

ARTICLE IV.

THE A POSTERIORI ARGUMENT FOR THE BEING OF GOD.

By Rev. L. P. Hickok, Prof. of Theol., West. Res. College, Ohio.

IN a former article* we examined the nature and application of the *a priori* argument to the proof of the being of God ; and it is the object of the present, to give a similar attention to the *a posteriori* argument. We thus follow out our primary design of investigating the nature and validity of all logical proof for the existence of God. Much the same order of investigation will be pursued in this as in the former case,—an examination of the nature of the argument, the methods of its application, and the amount of proof which it affords.

I. *The nature of the a posteriori argument for the being of God.*

In general it may be said, that it is directly the reverse of the *a priori* form of argument. Instead of deducing logical consequences from their grounds or causes, it begins with consequences, and reasons upwards to their grounds or causes. It is thus an argument from effect to cause. It necessarily presupposes experience, inasmuch as its *data* are all empirical. The ultimate principles and absolute truths, which are the elements of an *a priori* argument for the being of God, are of no use as the materials of an *a posteriori* argument ; but facts of observation, events, changes, phenomena, *effects* of all kinds are assumed as the *data* for finding both the existence and the characteristics of their remote origin, ground, or cause. These are all acquired from external nature through the senses, or from our own inward experience through consciousness, and thus belong entirely to our sensitive cognitions ; while the whole field of rational cognition, with its intuitions of universal and necessary truth, lies within the domain of the *a priori* form of argument alone.

But while all the materials which form the data for an *a posteriori* argument are given by experience, the principle by which valid conclusions are deduced from these data is itself a rational intuition, and independent of all experience. The *vin-*

* Biblical Repository, April, 1841, p. 273.

culum which is to bind every conclusion to its premise is the axiom that "*every event must have an adequate cause.*" No matter what are the facts or events which we assume, they must be utterly useless for all the purposes of an a posteriori argument, except upon the clear recognition of the necessary truth of this axiom. If events may take place absolutely uncaused and fortuitous, if any thing may spring into being from absolute nihility of both essence and efficiency, then of course no deduction from any event upwards to the cause of that event can be valid; since, instead of its having any cause, it may have come into being with no agency whatever, and thus be evolved from utter emptiness and vacuity. We are then obliged, in order to feel the validity of any a posteriori argument, to obtain settled and clear convictions of the law of causation, which is the only principle by which deductions can be made from facts to their sources.

In the world of both matter and mind we find one event followed by another, and among these cases of succession, the mind recognizes some peculiarity in the case of some of the antecedents, as other than a mere casual succession in their connection with their consequents; and, to mark this peculiarity, the antecedent is called the *cause*, and the consequent the *effect*. That which secures the perpetuity of this order of sequences is called *power*. The main inquiry is in relation to this idea of power. Whence is it derived? What is the ground of conviction that, in like circumstances of the antecedent, this power will secure the consequent? How can we verify the conviction which we feel, that like causes will always produce like effects? These inquiries, which are each of a similar nature, go to the basis of all our confidence in an a posteriori argument.

That philosophy which derives all its ideas from sense and reflection upon the ideas given by sense, has given different answers, and adopted different theories to account for our conviction that there is some *necessary* connection between a cause and its effect. As experience is the origin of all its ideas, so the idea of *power*, or necessary connection between cause and effect, must be gained from experience. But as sense or experience can give us nothing but the simple fact of succession, there are found considerable difficulty and diversity, in accounting for the idea of something called power, which is the origin of the expectation or conviction, that whenever we see the antecedent or cause, we shall also always see it accompanied by

its consequent or effect. Sense certainly can never find any thing in the cause which we call power ; it can never verify that there is any thing there which makes the effect necessary ; it can only recognize the simple fact, that when and where the antecedent is then and there the consequent is.

We can take the theory of Hume, and say that the mind gets this idea of necessary connection by the frequent experience of the repetition of the sequences. The transition of the thought and attention from the antecedent to the consequent gives a peculiar "*impression*," exceedingly faint at first, but by repetition growing stronger, until it arises to a definite conviction, a full "*belief*" that this connection will be invariable : "Belief being only a more vivid, forcible and steady conception of an object, than what the imagination alone can attain." There is thus in reality no *necessary* connection. It is only an imagination at first, and this strengthened to "*belief*" by frequent repetition. When we reason from effect to cause, therefore, there is only "*belief*" which has grown out of imagination, as the connecting principle, and which can never verify itself by any proof. It consists with real skepticism as to the fact, though the mind has received by mere repetition "*a vivid impression*" which it calls "*belief*."

The theory of Brown is but a modification of the above. There is nothing but mere antecedent and consequent ; still the mind of man is so formed that it believes, even from one experience, that the connection will be invariable, and expects it accordingly. But it is all resolved into the nature of the human mind. There is no truth in reality which can by any means be verified ; but we are so made as to expect that what has been once seen as an antecedent, will henceforth invariably continue so.

Or it may be assumed that we get the idea from *induction*. We have found by experience so many facts which imply that there is something in the cause making the effect necessary, that, from this wide induction, we at length feel warranted in deducing a general law, and affirming that all causes are necessarily connected with their effects. All our reasoning from effect to cause can be demonstration, therefore, only in such cases as we can verify by experiment ; and as no experience can bring the cause of the universe under human cognition, so we can never reason otherwise than to a probable conclusion, when we attempt, a posteriori, to find the author of the universe.

Lastly, it may be supposed that we get the idea of power, and

thus of cause and effect, from the conscious operation of our own minds. We *think*, and *will*, and feel conscious of an energy exerted; and thus learn to consider ourselves as causes of those effects, which follow our conscious energizing of some appropriate faculty. We then transfer this conscious energizing of the faculty in our minds to produce a given result to all external antecedents and consequents, and conceive them, as causes and effects, to be connected by some such energizing of power in the cause. From *analogy* therefore we conclude that all causes exert an efficient power which secures the existence of the effect. But while it may be admitted that this last has more plausibility than the former, it is still only an argument of analogy and can only be conclusive to this extent, that if all causes and effects are connected to each other as the mind is to the effects which it produces, then it is safe reasoning from effects to the existence of a cause; but all its conclusiveness rests upon the conviction, that what is true of the mind as a cause must be true of all causes. This last however is what experience can never verify; and thus if we have nothing more conclusive than our own consciousness applied to all causation by experiments, we must fail of demonstration beyond those very causes and effects which take place on the field of our own consciousness.

If then we know nothing of the law of causation but that which sense and experience can give us, we can never use an a posteriori form of argument to the proof of the being of God with any valid force and conclusiveness. At the highest point it will leave full place for the most incorrigible skepticism.

But, as was noticed in the former article, man is endowed with a far higher and nobler faculty than any thing which is indicated by sense and reflection. He has the power of rational intuition, and can thus see absolute and universal truths in their own light alone, and unhesitatingly affirm what is and eternally *must be*, independent of all deductions from experience. And in this very position the whole principle of causation, with its power to produce effects and its connection with its effects, is viewed by the mind. Empirical facts have no connection with it, and give no support to it. The mind intuitively and *a priori* sees the truth as necessarily and universally existing.

Nothing cannot produce *something*; *ex nihilo nihil fit*. This is a truth seen by the mind to be as necessary and as universal as that "*the whole is greater than any of its parts.*" It

is an absurdity and an impossibility to conceive the opposite. And thus every event must have some adequate cause. We need only to postulate any event whatsoever, and the deduction is valid and necessary, its cause or ground of being also exists. And into this idea of cause there enters necessarily the possession of *efficient power*. It is not essential that we determine how the cause receives its efficiency, whether by an impartation from some constant external agency, or from the possession of a nature in which there is the perpetuated property of efficiency; but it is essential to the very idea of a cause that it have in some way efficient power. No matter how intimate or certain the connection of antecedent and consequent; if the mind does not recognize something in the antecedent as the efficient producer of the consequent, it never recognizes the antecedent as the *cause* of the consequent. The truth is ultimate and necessary, that the cause must possess this inherent efficiency or it is no cause. We never suppose the day to be the cause of the night in consequence of its being the invariable antecedent, nor do we give to any casual antecedent the name of a cause; but, in order to the mind's apprehending any thing as a cause, it must invest it with efficiency to produce the effect. There must be something in it which is not in any thing else to connect it with the effect, as the efficient producer of that effect.

The mind may not be able, before all experience, to affirm of any thing that it possesses an efficiency to produce a given effect; but no mind will ever recognize it as a cause, until it is conceived as possessed of this efficiency. This is the essential point in the idea of causation, not as antecedent merely, but as efficient producer. We may conceive of the loadstone as a simple entity; but when we contemplate it as the antecedent to the peculiar phenomena of magnetism, it is no longer as a simple entity, but as possessing an inherent efficiency to produce these phenomena as the effects of its action. Nothing can be a substitute or an equivalent for the inherent property of efficiency in our idea of causation; there can be no idea of cause without it.

By this rational intuition of the ultimate and necessary truth, that "*every event has its adequate cause*," and that this cause is connected to the effect as *its efficient producer*, we are prepared to take any event that may offer, as a datum for a valid deduction of the existence of its cause. On this ground an *a posteriori* argument logically applied is a demonstration. Its

conclusions are not matters of mere belief and probability, but of science and certainty.

In the nature of an *a posteriori* argument we have then its *data*, which are purely empirical, and its principle, as the *vinculum* of all its deductions, which is purely an intuition of reason.

II. *Some of the methods of applying the a posteriori argument to the proof of the being of God.*

1. The argument from effect to cause simply. That something does exist is a fact to which our senses and our consciousness bear witness. Changes take place within and around us. Events are occurring, and phenomena manifesting themselves on every hand. We may take any or all of these as our materials for an argument. They have all been produced by some adequate cause, and are, therefore, effects which may be traced upwards to their sources. That which is found to have been the cause of a present event is, when found, seen itself to have been an effect of some previous causation; and thus the series may be pursued upward, by sure and necessary deductions from effect to cause indefinitely. It is abundantly manifest that in tracing up these effects to causes, there is a constant convergency towards unity. Effects run up into common causes, and these again are effects of more general causes; and it is thus manifest that, as we pursue this retrogression, the number of acting causes constantly diminishes, and would thus indicate that at last they all terminate in one grand first cause of all. It is, we believe, quite manifest, if not from the action of all causes in their own nature, yet from experience and observation, that of the great mass of acting causes very few are to be considered as efficient for one effect only. They put in operation, as the effects of their action, many more causes; and thus efficient agents augment, and the branches expand incalculably as the lengthened series of causes and effects move onward. By an *a posteriori* argument from simple effect to cause, we necessarily approach towards the point of unity in all causation; and thus we have the highest probability that all does in fact depend upon one grand, original source of all efficiency. Thus far we can go safely by an *a posteriori* argument from simple effect to cause; but this is the end of our discoveries by this process. We cannot demonstrate that all does really terminate in absolute unity. And if we suppose ourselves to have arrived at the point where all causes meet, and thus find one existing being, whose efficiency is adequate

to the production of all the events and changes which have had their beginning since, yet, so far as a posteriori reasoning is concerned, we are obliged to go backward still through an unending series. This highest point of all the universe of causes needs itself a cause or ground of being, as much as any that we have found from the present upward; and mere a posteriori argument can have nothing to do in predicating *self-existence*, or *necessary existence* of any of the conclusions to which it comes. They are effects and must have their cause, so far as the nature of this argument reaches; and thus, if it finds a point in which only single links go off upward, it must follow on its solitary track without a termination. This point, moreover, in which we assume that all causation begins to diverge into its multiplied branches, has nothing else, so far as we have yet found, but simple existence in the possession of physical efficiency to produce effects. We *have* proved, and, by an argument from effect to cause simply, we *can* prove no possession of intelligence or freedom. We have nothing yet which answers our idea of God. It is the mere "*plastic power*" of the old infidel philosophers, a blind unconscious cause, working out its necessitated effects under the changeless destiny of its own law of development.

2. The argument from final causes. An a posteriori argument from effect to cause is valid, not only for the deduction of the *existence* of the cause from the effect, but also for the *characteristics* and *attributes* of that cause. The intuitive, ultimate truth is "an *adequate* cause for every event;" and the event may be of such a nature as to prove, intuitively, that no mere blind, physical efficiency can be adequate to its production. In many things there is so nice and complicated an adaptation to an end, that we are forced to predicate intelligence and design of its cause, as alone adequate to its production. Its adaptation must have had a cause as well as its existence, and the only cause for adaptation to an end in the effect is intelligence or wisdom. The final cause to which the adaptation of the thing is directed proves the author to have seen the end, and selected the means with a design to secure it. The qualities of the effect are the data for deducing the attributes of the cause.

The validity of this form of the a posteriori argument may be confirmed by two methods. One is that of *consciousness*. We are conscious that where we have an end to gain, we adapt means with a design to secure it; or when we are adapting

and using certain means, we are conscious that we have an end in view which is the final cause of our agency. We at once conclude, from *analogy*, that the same exhibitions in other cases are a proof of the same facts in other minds.

The other and more conclusive method is direct, rational intuition. Adaptation,—fitness to an end,—is an ultimate fact, which the mind can intuitively perceive in the object which is its ground or field of manifestation. When a machine is understood, the adaptation of its parts to an end is as direct an intuition, and thus as really a fact of certain knowledge, as is the truth of a mathematical demonstration, when the whole process of proof is in the mind. And this adaptation in the effect is as intuitively perceived to involve design in the cause, as the existence of an effect involves an existing cause. The adaptation is the effect of design as a cause, and thus where the effect exists the cause must be.

The ground of argument is therefore solid, and its deductions are demonstrations. It is also important to remark here, that one instance of adaptation is conclusive for the deduction of an intelligent cause. One watch, or one steam engine as conclusively evinces an intelligent cause, as would a hundred. The number and variety of the cases of adaptation disclose “the manifold wisdom” of the cause, rather than the mere facts of intelligence. The multiplication of the facts of design constitute so many separate arguments for the existence of a designing cause. The whole universe abounds with these traces of design, multiplied, minute, extended and complicated beyond description. In this broad field have been the extended researches of Derham, Ray, Paley, Brougham, and the numerous learned authors of the *Bridgewater Treatises*;—all accumulating the demonstrations of an intelligent cause, from the multiplied facts of adaptation which they discover. But all tend to the same point, and stop short at the same conclusion. The argument has a limit in its own nature, and it is important to find the boundaries beyond which no proof from final causes can reach.

Intelligence that can adapt means to ends in a most complicated, extended and skilful manner exists. The conclusion here is demonstration. As in the case of simple cause and effect, the constant simplification and tendency to one origin, as we follow back these causes in which adaptation appears, would indicate that ultimately they would be traced up to one

source ; and more probable still, the harmony of all these moving causes and their apparent converging tendencies to one grand consummation in their future progress bespeak a unity of design and purpose, as if all were the plan of one great master mind.

But here is the utmost we can make of the argument. We cannot demonstrate any thing more than unity of design, which, so far as an a posteriori argument can go, is consistent with the existence of many intelligences who are agreed in plan and operation. And if we were to assume one mind as the source of all this consecutive series of means to an end, we could not stop at this point. Our argument is that all adaptation involves intelligence as a cause ; and with only an a posteriori process we can find no stopping point. For if a watch involves an intelligent man as its maker, we go to the man and find him adapted to make watches and we infer a designer ; the man had an intelligent maker. But we must not stop here ; the maker of the man is adapted to make men and worlds ; and we are compelled by the argument to find again a higher intelligent cause. Moreover, should we predicate absolute unity of this intelligent cause, and stop the progress of our argument in him, we have not yet found a being which answers to the idea of God. We have found nothing in *kind* distinguishing him from the animal. There is a superior degree of intelligence ; but animals have contrivance, design, power of adapting means to ends, and changing their means with changing circumstances, and often exhibit surprising art and skill. We may stand by an ant-heap or a beaver-dam, and find intelligence of precisely the same kind and exhibiting itself in precisely the same manner of skill, as when we look at man himself, "so fearfully and wonderfully made," or at all the traces of design in the world around him. The difference is nothing but *degree*. But must we not prove for the being of God something more and something other than the *kind* of intelligence which may belong to some great animal ?

We proceed therefore to a higher form of the argument.

3. The exhibitions of an intuitive cognition of absolute truth. There may be as clear evidences in things themselves of the presence of absolute truth as of design ; and the deduction from these traces in the effect to the possession of a capacity for rational intuition in the cause may be as valid and conclusive as that of intelligence from the fact of adaptation. If

we see an orrery or planetarium philosophically constructed, or a Gunter's scale, or a gauging-rod, we intuitively perceive the necessity of a cause which comprehends *a priori* principles, and ultimate truths. Or if we see a system of regulations and influences founded upon and embodying moral principles, we know that its author had the capacity to see *the right* as an ultimate truth, and to comprehend the absolute law of moral distinctions. We shall recognize in this the possession of a faculty which discriminates between rational and animal intelligence in *kind* and not merely in *degree*. Whenever we find the exhibition of any such universal and necessary truths as the principle and guide of the action, we know that the agent possessed powers of mind which mark an everlasting distinction in *kind*, between him and that intelligence which all the traces of adaptation to an end in the animal can manifest. Here, therefore, is the same sound principle for a demonstration, as in the former methods of *a posteriori* argument.

We look abroad then in nature, and the data for these deductions abound. The laws of planetary motion, the ratio of the distance and force of gravitation, and the collocation of the heavenly bodies in accordance therewith, the laws of crystallization, etc., etc., furnish the elements of an irrefragable deduction that there exists a rational mind as the author of these arrangements, who, intuitively and independently of all experience, comprehends abstract principles, and necessary truths, and universal verities, and to which no augmentation of the powers of an animal can approach.

Moreover, we are conscious of the perception of right and wrong, and the feeling of moral accountability, and experience the retributions of good and evil within us in accordance with our moral conduct, and are thus obliged to infer that our maker knows and regards the principles of moral rectitude. We see around us the indications of a widely extended moral system of which we are component parts; all the workings of which are evidently securing the moral trial and discipline of its subjects, and all tending onward to some great moral consummation; and we know that there must be a moral maker and governor, who will hold all responsible to a righteous tribunal. We have the data for a complete demonstration that there is in being a rational and moral cause.

There is but one source of difficulty in coming to this conclusion which needs to be obviated. We have assumed as a

necessary truth, that the manifestation of ultimate principles in the effects produced involves the power of rational intuition in the agent; and that this distinguishes him from all animals. But there is at least one animal whose works are in accordance with the strictest mathematical principles. The bee forms its cells with the most rigid mathematical precision, adapted to the greatest economy in space, strength and materials. The celebrated Colin Maclaurin, a mathematician of the early part of the eighteenth century, demonstrated, by the most exact calculation, that the angles and parallelograms in the cells of the honey-comb were always invariably the same; and precisely such as, with the greatest room, secured also the greatest strength with the least material. Has the bee, then, a perception of the ultimate truths of mathematics?

Past all doubt, had we discovered these properties in the cell of the bee, and knew nothing of its maker, we must have referred it to a cause possessing the attributes of rational intuition. But when we now know the immediate architect, and thus determine its destitution of all mathematical science, we must refer this instinctive skill to a higher source, and predicate rational intuition of that mind which made the bee, and fitted her to work after this rule, unconsciously, through all her generations. Just as in the case of the mariner, who, mechanically, with quadrant and tables made and calculated to his hand, can determine his latitude and longitude, but knows nothing of the principles involved. While we know *his* ignorance, we know also that *some* mind has left here the undoubted traces of its philosophic powers and clear and certain intuitions. Thus, what at first might seem a violation of the principle, on the necessity and universality of which we had laid the validity of our demonstrations, is found, by further attention, ultimately to confirm the position which has been taken.

By an a posteriori argument from the exhibitions of an intuition of absolute truths in the works of nature, we obtain more than an intelligence which like the animal can adapt means to ends with the design of gaining the ends. There is the demonstration of a cause directing itself in its action by the absolute truth in necessary and universal principles. We can also say that, following these causes, in which are the traces of ultimate truth, as they retrograde from the present, they converge toward unity, and looking at the harmony of their adaptations and tendencies to the same ultimate result, there is an evidence of unity

of design, and thus a probable indication of *one* rational designer.

But here is our limit. We cannot *a posteriori* demonstrate absolute unity of cause; nor, if we assume that the author of this universe of effect and design and intuition is *one*, can we stop with him, and demonstrate that he has no external cause of being. The argument is the same in relation to ultimate principles as to adaptation. It must take every thing that it finds as an *effect* and thus demanding a *cause*, and consequently pursuing an infinite series in the line of causes which indicate intuition, as certainly and necessarily as in those which indicate design, or those of simple efficiency to produce effects. As the mathematics of the bee is instinctive, so may that of the maker of the bee also be instinctive, and thus demanding a higher origin. Yea, from the very nature and law of an *a posteriori* argument, we must seek as necessarily for an author to the maker of the heavens as to the maker of the honey-comb. And here the *a posteriori* argument stops in its development of any thing new in its results. Henceforth it must go backwards to infinity, finding nothing but a mere antecedent link as the cause of the consequent, and differing in nothing from the consequent but mere priority of existence and action.

III. *The extent to which the mere a posteriori argument for the existence of God reaches.*

1. It finds a cause for all that has a beginning, except for this ultimate cause itself. In this respect it is powerless, and can never find any data to remove the exception. In mere *efficiency* it can never find any thing by which, as an effect, it can make the deduction that this deficiency originates itself. A *posteriori* reasoning knows nothing of self-existence, but only of derived existence. So in *design* and *rational intuition*, it can find no effects by which it can determine that the design and intuition are self-originated. It demands for them a cause, and it knows no other way of finding a cause than by a deduction *ab extra*.

2. It proves for this cause *unity* of design and counsel. The operation of the moving adaptations of nature may be put forth, and directed by many contemporary causes; and an *a posteriori* argument can never demonstrate that, at any period backward, there was in existence more than *one* cause. It can only prove that there is agreement or harmony of plan and operation, but not absolute unity of being in the cause.

3. It can prove that this adequate cause of all things *now* exists, and that from eternity an adequate cause for all things must have had a being, but it cannot reach into the *future*, and prove that this cause will exist the next hour. All its deductions are from events and facts of present or past being. In their case there is or has been a reality of existence, and hence a reality of their cause. But future existences, either as effects or causes, are not given, and cannot therefore be assumed as the data for any deductions. We must have the effect or we cannot infer the cause. An *a posteriori* argument goes back, but never can reach before.

4. It can prove the existence of the cause to be as extensive as the effects; but it can never prove absolute immensity for this cause, neither in presence nor agency. Wherever there are effects a cause must have energized; and as mighty as is the effect produced, so powerful must have been the energizing of the cause. But unless effects fill immensity, they can never prove the immensity of their cause, nor that there is a power which can reach beyond what has actually been accomplished.

An *a posteriori* argument, therefore, is utterly inadequate to demonstrate the being of an absolute, free and self-existent God. It finds a cause, and demonstrates the possession by that cause of efficiency adequate to the production of all that is in being below itself, but it fails utterly in elevating that cause to an identity with that which conforms to the complete idea of God.

By combining both the *a posteriori* and the *a priori* forms of argument, we can at least advance very far in the demonstration. The result will evince how conclusive this combined argument may be made. In our own view it fails in no point necessary to the proof of the being of God, though it should fail in identifying the *immediate* author of the universe as God.

The following are the several steps in the process we would pursue.

1. We would assume the very fact of the last and highest demonstration obtained by the *a posteriori* argument, as our position for a new process of reasoning. *An intelligent and rational causation, with unity of design, if not of existence, is in being, adequate to the production of whatever is, beside itself.* This is the extent of the *a posteriori* reasoning, but it is absolute demonstration so far. We therefore take solid ground when we assume this position. From this point we exclude all *a pos-*

teriori proof in our advance, and employ the *a priori* form of argument entirely. And here it is plain that we begin an argument *a priori* with great advantage over a process that is purely *a priori* from its origin. We have now *demonstrated facts* into which we may look, and *a priori* draw conclusions; but in the pure form of the argument we have nothing but necessary ideas from which to reason. The pure form of an *a priori* demonstration for the being of God may prove itself too high for man to reach; and yet the blended argument of both *a posteriori* and *a priori* be fairly within his power to urge to a conclusive demonstration.

2. In advancing from this position we begin with *unity of design*. From the very fact and nature of unity of design, there must ultimately be seen intuitively but one agent as the designer. If it be supposed that many agents conspire together to carry on harmoniously the different parts of one complicated plan, still it must be true that the plan is one and single. The pattern, exemplar or idea, after which all work to the point of final development, is a unit, and must have one mind only as its original ground of being. If all these conspiring agents see the whole plan; or each one sees only the particular part of the plan which he is effecting, it is the same in the result. One master mind among them or over them all must have furnished the model, and on its reception all unite in accomplishing it by consent; or the master mind uses them as mere agents in their various parts of effecting his design; or there is some law of unity which, involuntarily and instinctively to all, impels and guides in the moving process. In either case we come at a definite point of causation in which both design and efficiency meet together, and where there can no longer be a community of agents, but where one must stand sole and controlling above all others. This point of causation contains all that is beneath it, both of plan and execution, and from it goes out the energy which puts the whole moving series in operation. We have then absolutely *one* mind at the point of divergency of the operating causes in the universe,—itself the sum and source of all beneath its own existence.

3. This one mind is either a self-existent, independent and absolute cause in its own ground of being, or it is an effect of a previous cause external to itself. Grant it to be the last, and then it may be traced up to such first cause in its own absolute being, or there is an eternal series. But this last, it may be in-

tuitively seen, is an absurdity. Here is a positive existence, and must, somewhere, have its ground of being; and if you postulate an infinite series, it is a positive existence and must have its ground of being. But it is denied that there is any ground of being in any single link of the series; and no combination of negatives can make any approach to a positive ground of being; and thus, neither in any link, nor in any combination of links, can there be a ground of being for the series. There is a positive existence, and it must have its ground; but it is not in itself as a whole, nor in any of its parts; nor can it be in any thing out of itself, for it includes all within itself. The absurdity fixes the intuitive necessity of some point which shall be its own necessary, eternal and absolute ground of being, as the source and origin of all intelligence, reason and power.

4. From *necessary existence*, with intelligence, reason and efficiency for all causation, can be proved *everywhere* existence, or omnipresence; *everywhere* or absolutely eternal existence, including both *a parte ante* and *a parte post*, absolute *unity* of existence, both as simple or uncompounded in itself, and sole and exclusive in its possession of immensity; and also that it is the *free* and *voluntary* originator of all its own agency. The process of proof for these attributes is not here detailed; but suffice it to say that we think the process has been rigidly gone over in our own minds, and may be intuitively seen in every step by any clear thinking mind that will fix its attention upon the demonstration. For an illustration of the manner of the argument applicable in the main to all the above points, reference is made to Clarke's *Dem. of the Being and Attrib.* §§ 3, 5, 6, 7 and 9; and especially to the letters which passed between him and Bishop Butler, with others, in the appendix. To our minds there is in this way a demonstration of the being and attributes of God within the scope and compass of the human mind, and which rests upon perceived valid premise and deduction from beginning to end. The only point of defect, if that be really considered such, is the impossibility of absolutely demonstrating that the supreme self-existent God is identical with the immediate author of the universe of causes and effects. We find a link at the point from which all diverging causes go off; and while we can demonstrate that there must be some link which is *self-existent* and thus God, yet we cannot absolutely prove that it is the first one at the head of multiplying causes. A series longer or shorter may be assumed above this

link, and it cannot be overthrown by demonstration. It can only be said that you ascend for nothing; for you must have your self-existent link somewhere, and it may as well be predicated of the first as the thousandth. The absolute God is proved to be; and it is of no great importance that we cannot fix a link specifically by demonstration. That link *is*, and it is the *necessary and absolute* DEITY.

ARTICLE V.

REMARKS IN REPLY TO THE QUESTIONS OF "INQUIRER;"—Am. Bib. Repository for April, 1840.

By Leonard Woods, D. D. Prof. of Theology, Theol. Sem., Andover, Mass.

[Continued from Vol. IV. No. VIII., p. 485, October, 1840.]

To the questions proposed by "Inquirer," respecting the sinner's inability to obey the gospel, I have already given a reply. After having, for so long a time, turned my attention to another subject, I resume the task (not an unpleasant task) of discussing the several topics suggested by my unknown correspondent.

I now come to the *second* difficulty which Inquirer presents.

I had said, that "unrenewed men *invariably* have wrong affections and desires, and perfectly holy beings *invariably* have right affections and desires, in view of moral objects." This I thought would accord with the opinion of all those who believe the doctrine of the total depravity of the unrenewed. That doctrine is, that men, in their natural state, are sinful without any mixture of holiness. And it is only expressing the same thing in another manner, to say, that unrenewed men *invariably* have wrong affections and desires in view of moral objects. Does Inquirer deny this? Does he think that unrenewed men have a mixture of right moral affections; or that perfectly holy beings have a mixture of sinful affections? I presume not. What then is the difficulty? It is this. Some of the angels, who were *once* perfectly holy, did not continue so, but became sinful; and *now*, in their sinful state, they have wrong affections and desires. The same as to our first parents,

who fell from a state of holiness to a state of sin, and then had wrong affections. But are these facts contrary to the position, that *perfectly holy beings invariably have right affections*? Do they show that *perfectly holy beings* have *wrong* affections? In other words, do they show that perfectly holy beings are *not* perfectly holy? To predicate right affections of perfectly holy beings is to declare what *belongs* to those who *are* perfectly *holy*, not what belongs to those who are *sinful*. The wrong affections of fallen angels or fallen men are not the affections of perfectly holy beings, but of sinful beings. Inquirer asks, "whether our first parents, who were once sinless beings, invariably retained right affections." I answer, they retained right affections while they were perfectly holy. And this is all that my affirmation implies, and it is all that other similar affirmations imply. If I say, a perfectly righteous judge invariably conforms to the principles of justice, I declare what belongs to a perfectly righteous judge. And what I say would be true, although a judge, once righteous, should become unrighteous, and should then, as unrighteous, violate the principles of justice. In this case, it would not be a perfectly righteous judge that would violate the principles of justice. It does not belong to a perfectly holy being to hate God. A fallen angel is not a holy being.

Inquirer doubts as to the meaning of the phrase—"in view of moral objects." He says, and says truly, that I have applied this *view of moral objects* both to wrong affections and to right affections. And he adds: "It would seem, then, that the same objects occasion wrong affections in one class, and right ones in the other." I reply; it not only *seems* so, but it certainly is so. It is a plain matter of fact, that a view of moral objects excites affections in us according to our character and state. If we are believers, it excites love; if unbelievers, hatred. The followers of Christ saw and loved both him and his Father. But he said to unbelievers: "ye have both seen and *hated* both me and my Father." This is a fact which constantly occurs under the preaching of the gospel. The same truths are to one class of men a savor of life unto life; to another class, a savor of death unto death. Inquirer is doubtless familiar with this fact. But the expression that "*perfectly holy beings invariably have right affections*" seems to him to imply, that there can be no change from holiness to sin; that he, who is once perfectly holy, is so forever. Here I beg leave to say, I

had no such meaning in my own mind ; and I think the language would naturally convey no such meaning to the minds of others. Inquirer says : “ If in view of moral objects perfectly holy beings *must* invariably have right affections, what possible influence could temptation have over our progenitors ? ” But this is not my language. I did not say perfectly holy beings *must* invariably have right affections. This might look to the future, and might imply that no change could take place. What I said was, that perfectly holy beings invariably *have* right affections ; *have* them *as* holy beings, and *while* holy ; not that all holy beings are immutable.

As to the apostasy of holy beings, a speculative mind may find difficulties in abundance. What then ? What if we are unable to explain metaphysically the well known fact that holy beings have become sinful ? Can Inquirer explain it ? Can he solve all the difficulties respecting the introduction of sin ? That we, who have never known by experience what it is to change from holiness to sin, should be unable to understand the exact manner in which the change occurred, or the process of a holy mind in becoming sinful, is nothing strange. We have all the knowledge on the subject which is necessary for practical purposes, though not all which an unbridled curiosity craves. Let us then be content to know the facts in the case, the plain, important, practical truths. First. We may lay it down as an undisputed truth, a plain fact, that holy beings have apostatized. Secondly. We may lay it down as an undoubted truth, that the change from holiness to sin, in those who have apostatized, took place in such a manner as not to supersede or interrupt their moral agency. In the act of their apostasy, and after their apostasy, they retained all the powers and faculties of moral agents, all that belong to the proper subjects of law. Of course they are as really the subjects of law, and under as complete obligations to obey it, as they were before the change took place. This is plain. Again. Those who changed from holiness to sin were altogether culpable. The sinful act was theirs. The fault was theirs and theirs only. The tempter was indeed culpable for *his* conduct. But the blameworthiness of their apostatizing, or changing from holiness to sin, was wholly theirs. The design of *God* and the ordering of his providence were holy. What *he* did was perfectly right. This is also plain and unquestionable. Once more. The fact that rational and immortal beings, who were made in the image of

God, and who had motives of infinite weight to love and obey him, and who had experienced the happiness of obedience, became disobedient,—this should be a subject of deep sorrow, lamentation and astonishment. It was a most unreasonable, wicked and inexcusable thing. Did we not know the fact, we should regard it as next to an impossibility, that beings endued with such faculties and placed in such circumstances should sin against God. But the sorrowful, dreadful fact has taken place.

I might add to these plain truths, that God, according to his eternal purpose, will overrule the apostasy of man for the accomplishment of the most benevolent and glorious purposes. That he has done this, and that he will do it in a still higher degree in future time, is made clear by the teachings of his word and providence.

Now I would charge it upon myself to be content with such plain, undeniable and useful truths; and not to perplex my own mind, or the minds of others, with any of the difficulties which a subtle philosophy has thrown around the subject under consideration.

Inquirer says, he can make nothing more or less of my affirmations than the simple position: "once a perfectly holy being, always so; once a sinner, always so." I have said enough to show that this was not my meaning. I will add that the last part of the sentence just quoted, expresses what I apprehend would be a certain and universal fact, were it not for the interposition of divine grace in redemption. If the sinner were left entirely under the operation of mere law, the result would be, "once a sinner, always so." I doubt not Inquirer would fully accede to this.

He next refers to a declaration of mine, that the divine law "pre-eminently aims to control the affections and desires of the heart." He says: "this proposition seems, at *first* view, to be a very reasonable one." And I ask, does it not appear so on a *second* view, and a *third* view? Is it not so in reality? If Inquirer has any doubt, let him examine the law, and see if it does not relate primarily to the heart, and aim pre-eminently to and regulate its affections. Does not Christ expressly say that all the law is comprehended in two precepts? And both these precepts aim directly to control the affections of the heart? If Inquirer should undertake to set forth the divine law, would he not say at once, that it requires

us to love God supremely, and to love our neighbor as ourselves? And is not this the same as to say, it aims to control the affections? or, in other words, the same as to say, it aims to control *us* in *regard* to our affections?

Inquirer asks: "*In what respects* does the law undertake to control the affections and desires?" I answer, in *all* respects. It asserts its dominion over the whole field of our moral affections and desires. It reaches them at all times, and in all their exercises. I should be alarmed if any one should attempt to make the law less extensive than this. And what reasonable man would wish, in respect to any of his affections, to be exempt from the authoritative direction of the divine commands? Who, that is a friend of God, would wish for the liberty of loving or desiring, except in accordance with his perfect law?

Inquirer quotes my remark, that "holy and sinful affections, in the saint and in the sinner, arise *spontaneously* from the presence or contemplation of moral objects." And is it not so? When the saint contemplates the divine law, does he not love the holiness which it requires? Does he not love it *instantly*, as soon as he looks at it? When he thinks of God, if he is in a right state of mind, he has no occasion to *reason* with himself, and, by motives drawn from other sources, to persuade himself to love God. As soon as he has a just conception of God, he loves him. To a man of an upright mind, God's own excellence is the highest motive to love; and it is motive enough. And under the influence of this supreme motive, he will love instantly and *spontaneously*, in proportion as his heart is in a holy frame. Edwards says, that at a particular period of his life, merely seeing the name of God or Christ in a book instantly filled his heart with love and joy. It evinced a purified and spiritual mind.

Why should Inquirer demur at the word *spontaneous* in this case? For a man to love an object *spontaneously*, is to love it of his own accord, or, as we may say, of his own free will, from the impulse of his own heart, without being urged by any foreign cause; it is to love from one's own disposition, unconstrained by any influence from without. (See Johnson and Webster on the words, *spontaneous*, *spontaneously*, *spontaneousness*.) It is an obvious truth, that affections which arise *spontaneously*, show the real character of the man. If any one loves you, not *sua sponte*, not freely, not from his own heart, but by constraint, or under some foreign influence, what value

do you set upon such affection? On this whole subject my appeal is to experience and consciousness. When divine things, in their moral excellence, are presented to the view of a holy being, does he wait for some other consideration to come in and help to excite his love? Does he go about to reason himself into the feeling of love? Or does his heart lie dormant till it is roused to put forth the affection by a command of the will? We shall find, on careful inquiry, that we always judge favorably of ourselves in proportion as our affections towards divine objects rise spontaneously and freely in our minds; and that we cannot but look upon men as sinful, in proportion as their hearts rise spontaneously against God and holiness.

What shall we think of the opinion, not unfrequently advanced at the present day, that our affections and desires in view of moral objects are neither good nor bad in themselves, but only in consequence of our voluntarily cherishing and indulging them? The opinion is, in my view, far from correct. If the affections or feelings which a holy being spontaneously exercises towards moral objects are not *right* affections, how can he be praiseworthy for *cherishing* them? And if the spontaneous affections of the sinner towards moral objects are not in their own nature *wrong*, how can he be *culpable* for cherishing or indulging them? Can we be culpable for indulging feelings which are in themselves innocent? If we may have affections in our hearts for a short time without fault, why not for a longer time? If we may innocently begin to exercise them, why may we not innocently continue to exercise them? When a good man cherishes any affections or desires towards moral objects, does he not do it with the idea that they are *right—right in themselves*? And when he endeavors to suppress or eradicate any affections towards moral objects, does he not do it from the conviction that they are in their own nature *wrong*? It is evident from our Saviour's teaching that a man is criminal for *having* a desire after forbidden objects; not only for *indulging* it and *complying* with its cravings, but for *having it in his heart*. And is not every one, who has an awakened conscience, fully persuaded that it is so? And as there is such a thing as sinful or corrupt desire—desire which is sinful in itself—the first rising of it in the heart must be sinful. It seems to me an exceedingly strange and unfounded opinion, that the divine law justifies a man for the first exercise of malice, envy, revenge or impurity, and condemns him only for

continuing the exercise ! Who can suppose such a thing as that the divine law permits a moral agent, either at the commencement of his being, or afterwards, to put forth, for a time, such affections and desires towards moral objects, as his unsanctified heart may prompt, only requiring him not to *repeat* them ? Surely that law which is “ perfect,” and “ exceedingly broad,” must bind a man through the whole of his existence, as an intelligent, moral being, at one time as well as another. I am sure that any position contrary to this is false, and that the arguments urged in its support are sophistical. It is indeed true, that an unrenewed man is culpable for *gratifying*, and for *continuing* to *exercise* the moral affections, which he at first exercises spontaneously. But *why* is he culpable ? Because they are *wrong* affections. Were not the affections themselves contrary to the law of God, how could he be a transgressor for *having* them in his heart, or for *continuing* to have them ?

On this subject I appeal to the devout and watchful Christian, who faithfully searches his own heart, and strives to be holy. His testimony is better than speculative arguments. Let him speak. Does not his experience exactly correspond with that of the apostle ? In direct opposition to his settled purpose, or the determination of his will, does not pride or self-esteem, or covetousness, or envy, or ill-will, or impure desire rise in his heart ? He needs not to be told that every such affection is sinful. He *knows* it to be so. He confesses it, and prays to be delivered from it, and abhors himself on account of it ; and from time to time he is more or less successful in subduing it. But before he is aware, and without waiting for the previous consent of his will, it comes up again and again. It is what our Saviour says “ proceeds out of the heart.” Thus he finds the words of the apostle, Gal. 5 : 17, verified in his own experience. *The flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh ; and these are contrary the one to the other, so that he cannot do the things that he would.* It is all a matter of experience, not of abstract reasoning. So it was with St. Paul. He found a law in his members, (doubtless meaning his affections,) warring against the law of his mind. He tells us, that the good which he would, he did not, and the evil which he would not, that he did. No wonder he was distressed with this law in his members, this body of death, and cried out, “ O wretched man that I am !” I say, it is all a matter of experience. And I appeal to the most faithful and spiritual

Christians, whether their exercises do not correspond with those of the apostle. I will only add, that any mode of philosophizing which overlooks these facts of experience must be regarded as defective.

Inquirer asks (p. 461): "To what is the law addressed?" And he suggests the difficulties which arise in his mind from supposing that it is addressed to the understanding, or to conscience, or to the will, or to the affections and desires. I think, as he does, that such a supposition involves the subject in difficulties. The law, strictly and literally speaking, is not addressed to the understanding, to the conscience, to the will, or to the affections of man, but to *man himself*; not to any faculty or susceptibility of the moral agent, but to *the moral agent himself*. What is the language of the law? It speaks to *man*,—to the intelligent personal being, *man*. "*Thou* shalt love the Lord thy God." "*Thou*," *man*, "shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." "*Thou* shalt not steal;" and so of the rest. Where the personal pronoun is not expressed, it is implied. "Remember the Sabbath day," i. e., remember *thou*. God addresses his law to this person—this whole person, *me*. He commands *me* to love him. He does not command my understanding to love; for my understanding is not a *person*. He does not command my conscience, or will, or affection to love; for neither my conscience, nor my will, nor my affection is a person. But he commands *me* to love. His law is addressed to *me*, as an intelligent, accountable being, possessed of all the powers and faculties necessary to complete moral agency; and it aims to direct and govern me in respect to all my moral exercises; primarily in respect to my affections, and then in respect to other acts of the mind; and to external conduct. Thus every man understands the subject, although, for convenience sake, he may often speak of the law as addressed to this or that faculty of the mind. It is the same in respect to other laws. The command of the father is to the *child*; of the civil ruler, to the *citizen*. And as the command is given to the *person*, so the obligation to obey rests *upon* the person; and it is the *person* that obeys. A disregard of this simple and obvious principle originates many needless difficulties and perplexities.

Inquirer refers to my remark, that *the will has no direct power, and frequently no power at all over the affections; and that a man cannot, by the power of his will, call forth the affection of love to God*. And does not Inquirer know this to be the

case? Is he not aware that man, while unregenerate, cannot subdue the enmity of his heart, and excite holy love in its place, by an act of his will? Does he not recognize it as a solemn truth, confirmed by Scripture and experience, that a carnal mind cannot sanctify its affections by the force of its own unsanctified volitions? And how is it with the believer? Can he, at any time, by an act of his will, banish his corrupt affections, and kindle the flame of sacred love in his heart? How is it with *Inquirer*, or with any other intelligent Christian? Is this the way in which the unholy feelings and desires of his heart were first expelled? Is this the way in which his love to God and divine things is now called forth? Has any thing ever occurred in his own experience, which evinces that he possesses a power to control his own affections by a volition? And does a Payson, an Edwards, or a Paul, or any one who discerns spiritual things in a spiritual manner, ever entertain the thought, that the want of such a power takes away his obligation or his accountability as a moral agent? I ask not *how* the want of such a power can be reconciled with perfect moral obligation. But I ask whether the enlightened Christian is not conscious of these two facts; first, that he has no direct power, and frequently no power at all, to govern his affections *by a volition*; and secondly, that he is under perfect obligation to love and obey God, and will be inexcusably guilty if he fails to do this. If *Inquirer* can explain *how* these two things may be reconciled, and solve all the hard questions which come forth from a speculative mind, then he is the man to undertake the work.

But if it is so that we cannot control our affections by an act of the will, many will be inclined to ask: *What then shall we do?* I am glad to have an opportunity to answer this question. For I think here is the place where we are specially taught to feel, and must feel, our entire dependence on the divine Spirit,—the very place where prayer to God is to come in for our relief. We are urged to prayer by all the principles of our rational nature. But by a just conviction of our sinfulness, our ruin and our helplessness, we are shut up to it. It is our only resort. So the Scriptures represent it. We must have help from God, or perish in our pollution. Holy affections are the fruits of the Spirit, not the product of our own will. This view of the subject is, you perceive, directly favorable to devotion. It begets a deep sense of dependence on the grace of God, and leads to constant prayer. And whatever a man's

speculative opinions may be, just so soon as he looks into his own heart, and forms any just conceptions of his own depravity, he will be sensible that without the help of divine grace, he can do nothing ; and he will look to God, not to the power of his own will, for the sanctification of his affections. Why is it that some ministers of the gospel use language in prayer so different from what they use in metaphysical discourse ?—that while in such discourse they speak much and strongly of the sufficient power or the complete ability of all men to do all that is required of them in the law and in the gospel, as soon as they engage in prayer, they acknowledge their weakness, acknowledge that without Christ they can do nothing, that they are not sufficient of themselves for any duty, that their strength is in God, and that all their help must come from him ? Why this difference ? It may be, because their language and their thoughts in metaphysical discourse are not adapted to serious religion and devotion. And if they find this to be the case, let them remember it. But I apprehend the reason to be more exactly this ; that, in prayer, Christians are likely to think soberly and justly,—likely to discern the truth, and to use the language of truth. And if you would know what is the language of truth, search the Scripture which is the word of the God of truth. Keep close to that, and you will not err. That holy book abounds in such representations as these:—that the preparation of the heart is from the Lord ; that sinners are sanctified not of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God ; that holy love is shed abroad in the heart by the Holy Ghost ; and that all right affections and desires are the fruits of the Spirit. Accordingly, when a Christian prays he does not say to God : I thank thee that I have full power to do all my duty without thy assistance ; that I am sufficient of myself to work out my own salvation. This is not the *truth now*. But when he prays, he must speak the words of *truth*. *My help cometh from the Lord. Without thee I can do nothing. All holy desires come from thee. Work in me all the good pleasure of thy goodness. Subdue every sinful affection. Make my heart pure. Strengthen me with thy strength in my soul.* What Christian does not pray in this manner ? And is not the language which sincere piety prompts us to use in prayer, the language of truth ?

In my remarks, I had advanced the following sentiment:—*that holy affections arise spontaneously in the saint, and unholy affections in the sinner, from the presence or the contemplation*

of moral objects. Inquirer undertakes to show what *consequences* would result from this sentiment. But our first question should be, whether the sentiment is *true*. Neither I nor my correspondent can be held responsible for the consequences which may follow from the truth, or from the declaration of the truth. Is then my representation conformed to fact? When a holy angel or a holy man turns his thoughts to God, and contemplates his moral excellence, is he not at once *pleased* with it? Does he not love it spontaneously? That is, does he not love it *freely, of his own accord, or from the disposition of his own heart?* Is he not pleased with it as soon as he sees it? If, when the object is present to his view, he puts forth any other mental act before he loves, what is that act? Is it an act of reasoning, by which he endeavors to persuade himself to love? But what need of reasoning to excite a holy being to love, when he already sees the loveliness of the object? Even if he should attempt by reasoning to excite his own love, what would he do, but to urge upon his own mind the supreme beauty and excellence of the object before him? Or, is the act, which precedes his affection to God, an act of *self-love*? When he beholds the divine character, does his heart lie still within him, till he has time to think that loving God will make him happy? And is it in reality a regard to his own happiness, which excites his love to God? Or, is the act which precedes his love an act of his *will*? That is, when a holy being has a distinct idea of God in his mind, is it true that, instead of instantly loving him, and in order to bring himself to love, he first *wills* to love? And is it true that his love is excited by such a previous volition? I am persuaded that good men will never be led, by their own experience, to view the subject in this light. That which renders God worthy of love, and which is the objective ground of love, is his *moral excellence*. As soon as holy beings see this they love. Is it their *cordial, free, unconstrained* act? And what is more just and reasonable, than that they should *love* God because he is *infinitely lovely*? The *subjective* reason is their own holy disposition. In this view they love God because they have a holy, spiritual nature, a heart in unison with divine excellence. And is not the opposite of all this true of the unholy? I ask, then, are not the facts in the case as I have represented them to be? If so, it follows, that the difficulty of which Inquirer speaks, and which we are all apt to feel, arises, not from any *misstatement* of

mine, but either from the very nature of the facts in the case, or from something faulty in the habit or state of our minds.

Inquirer says, if it be so, as I have represented, "then what tendency can the divine law have upon the mind of a sinner, except to increase his hatred of all that is holy, and thrust him further and further from salvation?" Here let us, for the present, pass by the word *tendency*, which may be somewhat ambiguous, and inquire what is *matter of fact*. Take the unrenewed sinner, whose carnal mind is enmity against God. Take him just as he is in himself, exclusive of the agency of the Holy Spirit. Is it not a fact that the law and the gospel, when brought before his unsanctified mind, do excite and increase his hatred of all that is good, and so thrust him further and further from salvation? Is not any result contrary to this owing to the grace of God? If the sinner is left to himself, is not the law, and the gospel too, a savor of death unto death? Has he not such a deceitful, wicked heart, and does he not so act out his depravity in view of divine things, that he is continually waxing worse and worse? And so far as he is given up to his own alienated heart, without the grace of the Holy Spirit, is not this the case uniformly and always?" We see then what is the *invariable fact*.

As to "tendency," I hold that the *proper* tendency of divine truth,—the tendency which it *ought* to have upon a rational being, and which it *would* have, were it not for the counter-influence of sin,—is to excite holy affection, and lead to holy conduct. But the sinner has an evil heart of unbelief. He has an obstinate love of sin, and dislike of holiness. And this inexcusable wickedness of his heart opposes the proper tendency of the truth, prevents the effect which it should have on the mind of the sinner, and turns the law and the gospel into a means of perdition. Coming in contact with a hard, impenitent heart, it proves to be a savor of death unto death. But this is no disparagement to divine truth. Its being followed by such an effect is to be ascribed wholly to the fault of the sinner.

Inquirer asks: "What then can the preaching of the law do, but to aggravate the awful doom of sinners?" And I put the question to him: *What else can the preaching of the law or the gospel do, unless the sovereign grace of God interpose, and give sinners a new heart?* If they are given over to their own unsubdued wickedness, as they justly may be, does not Inquirer

know the deplorable and dreadful fact, that, whatever may be their outward privileges, they will be continually treasuring up wrath against the day of wrath? This fact is so deplorable and dreadful, that it caused the Son of God to weep, and should cause us to weep,—yes, to weep day and night. The evil of man's heart is too obvious to be denied; and it is too deep and desperate to be remedied by human power. Can Inquirer think it a mistake of mine to say, that man's *depraved will* has no power to change his *depraved heart*?—in other words, that he has no power to change his *depraved heart* by an act of his *depraved will*? Would he affirm the contrary? Would he tell sinners, that by an act of their unsanctified will,—which is all the will they have,—they can sanctify their own hearts?—that by an unholy, selfish volition they can produce in themselves that holiness, which they neither love nor desire?

The doctrine of man's depravity is mysterious and astounding. But all that is mysterious and astounding in the doctrine lies in its truth. Man is a sinner. He has destroyed himself; and he is indeed lost. He has no power, by the exercise of any of his intellectual or moral faculties, without divine grace to restore himself to holiness and happiness. His help is in God, and nowhere else.

Inquirer refers to the following remark of mine: "It is a common sentiment, that the sinfulness of men is great in proportion as their passions and desires are awakened suddenly and uncontrollably in view of forbidden objects." I stated the case in which revenge, envy, covetousness and pride arise in the mind suddenly and uncontrollably in view of their appropriate objects. Now I ask Inquirer: Are not revenge, envy, covetousness and pride sinful? Are they not really sinful in themselves, though not developed in outward action? And is not the degree of sinfulness proportional to the strength and violence of the sinful passions and desires?

Inquirer says, he could assent to all this, if I had "conjoined some limitations or modifications." But what modifications are called for? Would he have me say, that ill-will, revenge, envy, covetousness and pride are sinful in some circumstances, but not in others? Does he wish me to point out the circumstances in which a man may have them in his heart for a time, and yet be guiltless? This I do not feel myself authorized to do; and I think Inquirer would himself start back from such a modification as this. For if I may have in my heart the

feeling of ill-will, envy and revenge once, without sin; why not twice?—and if for a short time, why not for a longer time? If the beginning of these affections is not wrong, why should we regard the continuance of them as wrong? Is it true that the divine law does not forbid the *existence* of these affections in our hearts, and that its only aim is to prevent their *continuance*? Or, to give the subject another shape, is it the intention of the law to keep these affections within certain limits, and to prevent them from going too far, particularly from coming out in visible action? Are we to understand the law as saying: you may have the emotion of ill-will or revenge towards man, or enmity against God, you may have the emotion rise in your heart, and if it is the *first* emotion of the kind, and if it rises spontaneously, and is not too strong, you are guiltless. But if you have a second and third emotion, especially if it becomes strong and violent, then you are culpable. Is this the meaning of the moral law? But suppose the second and third emotion of enmity against God or man is as spontaneous as the first, and of the same degree of strength. Why should it not be regarded in the same light?

In compliance with the suggestion of Inquirer, I am very ready to give "some modifications," or rather to explain and distinguish.

There are then, as I conceive, emotions, affections and desires of different kinds. Some are in their own nature morally right, i. e. conformed to the divine law; some are sinful, i. e. contrary to the law; and some indifferent, i. e., in themselves neither holy nor sinful. As to those of the first kind,—the law requires and approves them. As to those of the second kind,—the law forbids and condemns them. As to those which are indifferent, such as the natural appetite for food, the desire of property and of knowledge, the love of life, the love of offspring, and the affection existing between the sexes; what the law does in regard to these is to regulate them, to guard them against excess and perversion, and direct them to their proper end. God not only permits us to have these affections and desires, but, in the proper way, to indulge them, and act under their influence. We are as much justified in repeating as in beginning the exercise of them; in acting them out in our life, as in having them in our heart. We are only required to indulge and gratify them in proper measures, so as not to interfere with any higher duty, and for a proper end, i. e. that the glory of

God and the true welfare of ourselves and others may be promoted. See now how plain and obvious the difference between these emotions and desires, and those which are in themselves sinful; and how differently they are treated in the sacred Scriptures. Does the word of God require that we should take care to *regulate* our ill-will, envy and revenge towards our fellow-men, and our enmity against our Maker?—that we should keep them within proper bounds, and direct them to a proper end? Why, they *have* no proper bounds. There is no proper end at which we *can* aim in their exercise. In their own nature they are contrary to the divine law. They are disobedience. And where does the law undertake to *regulate disobedience*, and keep it within proper bounds? Instead of this, it forbids it wholly. It forbids us to have the commencement of it in our hearts. It condemns us for the first and feeblest emotion which is contrary to holiness, though never developed in action, and even though conscience should not at the time be so wakeful as to notice its turpitude.

Inquirer refers to a child who has inherited from his parents a strong appetite for intoxicating drinks, but has checked and refused to indulge it; and he asks, whether that child is guilty of intemperance. I answer, No. The mere bodily appetite is not intemperance. In itself it has nothing of a moral nature, any *more* than the extreme thirst of a man for water. We are sure of this from our own consciousness. Speculative reasoning has nothing to do with it. All that the law requires of him who inherits such an appetite is, that he should refuse to gratify it, and in every proper way strive to subdue it. If he loves God he will readily do this. And if he does this, we give him special credit for his temperance. We honor him more than if he had never been subject to such an appetite, and had never practised self-denial in refraining from indulging it. This is all plain; and what Inquirer says respecting it is obviously just.

But we cannot but notice the essential difference between such a bodily appetite and those dispositions and affections of the soul, which are in their own nature morally wrong, and which cannot for a moment exist without sin. To have a malevolent, envious, or revengeful feeling in the heart, is to be a transgressor. Merely *having the emotion* shows a man to be depraved and guilty. *Jesus* never had such an emotion. He never had the least degree, not even the beginning of the feel-

ing of ill-will, pride, envy or revenge. In his pure heart no emotion or desire contrary to holiness was ever found, no, not for a moment. Of this I am certain.

We come now to the case of a reformed debauchee. The supposition of Inquirer is, that although the reformed man is now a true Christian, he is "often and violently assailed with desires and passions like those of former days," i. e. impure desires, desires after forbidden pleasures; but that he steadily opposes them. The question is, how we are to regard such a man in his present state. Let the man himself answer this. He regards the impure passions and desires referred to, as the sin that dwelleth in him. He confesses them to God and mourns over them as such. He says within himself: How bad must be the tree which bears such fruit! How evil the heart from which proceed such vile and hateful passions and desires! In short, does he not really look upon himself as the subject of an inward defilement, a spiritual evil, in proportion to the frequency and violence with which he is assaulted by the passions and desires of his former wicked life? And when he resists them, does he not do it with the full conviction that they are morally wrong, and wholly without excuse in the sight of God? But if, through the strength of religious principle, and the help of divine grace, he overcomes and eradicates these evil passions and desires, we regard it as a great and virtuous achievement. We honor him for resisting and subduing, not what is innocent, but what is sinful.

The principle which I have endeavored to support, is evidently true in regard to holy affections and desires. Love to God and desire for his glory show the heart to be sanctified in proportion as they arise spontaneously and fervently in view of the object. When our moral state is right, nothing is necessary to excite love to God but the sight of his character. As soon as we see what he is we love him. The affection is awakened immediately when the object is presented before the mind, whether it is presented in consequence of a previous act of the will or not. So it was with Jesus. No reasoning, no persuasion, no antecedent act or effort of his will was necessary to elicit his love. As soon as he thought of his Father, he loved him, and desired his glory. The affection was always joined with the thought. If it is not so with us, if, when we turn our thoughts to God, our hearts slumber, or if earthly affections lodge within us, and if we find voluntary exertion and labor ne-

cessary to dislodge those earthly affections, and to prepare ourselves to love God, it is a certain proof that the law of sin is still warring against the law of holiness, and that the work of sanctification is very incomplete.

It will, I hope, be kept steadily in mind, that the main point now under consideration is a matter of *experience* and *direct consciousness*, and not of speculative argument.

Some writers, who admit that an act of the will has no direct control over the affections, still hold that, as it is by an act of the will that we bring before our minds those objects which excite the affections, it is this previous voluntary act which gives the character of morality to the affections. The reason why they hold this opinion is, that they have already adopted the principle, that voluntary acts, and those only, are morally good or evil. In my view, this principle, as at present understood, is far too narrow, and overlooks truths of essential importance. But I shall not enter on the consideration of the subject here, except in the way of appeal to plain common sense.

According to the opinion above stated, if by an act of our will we put ourselves in a situation where divine and spiritual objects will be presented before us, and if we do it for the purpose of awakening pious affections in our minds, those affections, when thus awakened, are holy and praiseworthy; and are so, because we voluntarily put ourselves in such a situation. And if, by an act of the will, we knowingly put ourselves in a situation, where objects will come before us which will excite wrong affections, we are then blameworthy for those affections; and we are so, merely because we voluntarily came into such a situation.

Now I acknowledge that the previous act of the will above mentioned, and the affections which followed, are, in the first case, good and praiseworthy, and, in the second case, blameworthy. But that the affections are right or wrong, and that we are worthy of praise or blame on account of them *merely* because we voluntarily placed ourselves in such a situation,—this I do not admit. For suppose that, without any previous arrangement or choice of mine, a good man comes and presents before me some striking view of the glorious character of God, which instantly excites reverence and love in my heart. Or suppose such a view of God is unexpectedly suggested to my mind by some event of divine providence, over which I have no control; and in consequence of it, I have at once the

affection of reverence and love. Must I regard this affection as destitute of piety and goodness, because I exercise it in such circumstances? Do these circumstances deprive me of moral agency? Or suppose without any intention of mine, I am brought into a situation where objects are presented before me, which suddenly excite the feeling of ill-will, envy, or revenge. Is such a feeling innocent, and am I blameless for exercising it because I exercise it in such a way? Do I cease to be a moral agent? Is it not evident that the affection is of the same nature, and that it indicates the same character of mind, whether it is exercised in consequence of a previous act of the will, or otherwise? What difference can it make in the judgment we pass upon benevolence or ill-will, love to God, or enmity against him, whether the object which elicits it comes before the mind in one way or another? Is not the object the same? Is not the affection the same? And are not we the same moral, accountable beings?

Take another case. An irreligious, wicked man knows by experience, that the truths of the gospel stir up within him strong dislike and opposition of heart. He therefore wishes to avoid every person and every situation that will be likely to bring these truths before him. But unexpectedly and contrary to his will, a Christian goes to him, and in the kindest manner presents some precious gospel truths before him, in view of which his heart at once kindles into violent hatred and wrath. Do you think his feelings cease to be sinful, because the object exciting them was brought before his mind without his intention, and contrary to his choice?

See what a fearful influence the theory I am opposing would have upon the divine law. Doubtless the moral law primarily and essentially requires that, and that only, which is of a moral nature. Now, according to the theory under review, the first and great command, instead of requiring love itself, requires that previous act of the will, by which we put ourselves in a situation where the object of love shall be presented before us. And our putting forth this previous act would constitute obedience, whether the affection followed or not. On the other hand, if we should really love God when his character is brought to our view unexpectedly and without our previous design, the affection, however pure and elevated, but not resulting from a previous act of the will, would lose its moral nature, and would not be obedience to the first and great

command ; although, after all, it is the very thing which the law requires. The same as to the command, "Thou shalt not covet." If we really covet our neighbor's house or wife, we are not transgressors, unless we had a previous voluntary agency in bringing the object before us. How often soever and how strongly soever we may covet, we are not blameworthy, if the exciting object is presented to our view without our choice. Now who of us has any right to take such liberty as this with the law of God, and to say, that it is not obeyed by that very affection which it requires, and is not disobeyed by that very affection which it forbids ? Who of us would willingly be responsible for the consequences of such a theory ?

As I understand the subject, if a man spontaneously puts forth either good or bad affections in view of objects brought before him without his previous design, this very circumstance does, in some respects, exhibit the goodness or badness of his character with peculiar clearness. If a man's heart is such that, whenever moral objects are brought before him, whether by his own voluntary act or not, he is at once filled with right affections and desires, we attribute to him the character of singular excellence. We say, he has an eminently good heart. And if, whenever moral objects are brought before another man, even against his intention, his heart instantly kindles into bad emotions and desires, we say, his character is stamped with uncommon depravity. In this we cannot be mistaken. Fruit growing thus spontaneously makes it very plain what the tree is. Here there is no constraint. The heart acts itself out with perfect freedom. So Christ says : "A good man, out of the good treasure of the heart, bringeth forth good things ; and an evil man, out of the evil treasure, bringeth forth evil things."

The remaining topics introduced by Inquirer must be deferred to another opportunity.

ARTICLE VI

REVIEW OF QUINCY'S HISTORY OF HARVARD UNIVERSITY.

By one of the Professors of Yale College.

The History of Harvard University, by Josiah Quincy, LL.D., President of the University. In two volumes. Cambridge: John Owen. 1840.

[Continued from page 195.]

THE first proof of the liberality and catholicism of the founders of Harvard College, President Quincy finds in its early charters. He says: "The first constitution of Harvard College established in 1642, in enumerating the powers granted and the objects proposed to be attained by its foundation, makes use of these simple and memorable terms: *To make and establish all such orders, statutes and constitutions, as they shall see necessary for the instituting, guiding and furthering of the said college and the several members thereof, from time to time, in piety, morality and learning.*"* In the charter of 1650, the objects of the institution are stated to be, "the advancement of all good literature, arts and sciences," and "the education of the English and Indian youth of this country in knowledge and godliness." The terms "piety" and "godliness," the author supposes to be "of all others the least susceptible of being wrested to projects merely sectarian." In reference to the language of these charters he remarks: "It is impossible even at this day, when the sun of free inquiry is thought to be at its zenith, to devise any terms more unexceptionable, or better adapted to assure the enjoyment of equal privileges to every religious sect or party."

The question is here immediately suggested: In what respect do these early charters of Harvard College, differ from the charters of similar establishments, which preceded it in England and other parts of Europe? To judge of the claims of the

* Vol. I. p. 46.

founders of Harvard College to a catholicism in that age so extraordinary, we wish to see distinctly what real advance was made, at the very outset in Massachusetts, towards liberalizing collegiate institutions, assuring "equal privileges to every religious sect or party," and preventing such seminaries from being "wrested to projects merely sectarian;" for it is most manifest, if the charters of Harvard, in their general provisions, differ not materially from such instruments as the founders must have had before them for models, that the conclusion as to the catholic spirit which they breathe is altogether too universal; the argument proves too much. If the language of these charters is not more liberal than that of earlier charters, the point to which this reasoning necessarily brings us is, that most, or all of those who were founders of literary institutions before the year 1642, as well as at that time, were influenced by views of the most enlarged catholicism; and that among this class of men throughout Christendom there has been little or nothing of bigotry, exclusiveness, or sectarianism;—a position, it is presumed, which President Quincy is hardly prepared to admit.

We have looked into the charters of the colleges in the English universities, as far as our limited means would allow, to ascertain the manner in which religion is mentioned, and its interests secured in those instruments; as these were the charters with which the founders of Harvard College were probably familiar, and which they would most naturally use as models in drafting a charter for themselves. We are by no means prepared to affirm universally on this subject; yet we are satisfied that the general fact is, that the precedents, to which the founders of Harvard College would of course look, and which they would be most likely to follow in forming its constitution, are less particular on the subject of religion, less definite and exclusive than the charter which they actually framed. In the Bull of John XXI. published in 1318, by which the several colleges in Cambridge were united in a university, neither "piety" nor "godliness," nor religion in any form, nor even the Holy Roman Church is mentioned; yet to infer from this, that the pontiff was looking forward to the time, when the church would be divided, and in the true spirit of modern liberality was endeavoring "to assure the enjoyment of equal privileges to every religious sect or party," would hardly be warranted by the premises. It would be to apply the opinions and usages of one age to explain and illustrate those of another

wholly unlike ;—a kind of reasoning, the correctness of which no one will maintain.

So far as we have been able to ascertain facts in relation to this subject, charters had been granted to colleges both in England and Scotland only to give a corporate existence to a literary society, or to confer certain rights and privileges, which were thought essential or expedient for the attainment of the objects of its establishment ; but in no case to secure the profession of particular articles of faith. These were left to the care of visitors of particular foundations or of the whole society ; and the seminary itself was considered as having authority to form rules for upholding orthodoxy or excluding heresy. A college was instituted *ad orandum et studendum* ; and the mode of arriving at these objects was prescribed by those of its own body who were authorized so to do, subject, however, to the control of its visitor or visitors. This arrangement was thought to give all the security to the prevailing faith, which the case admitted or required.

The founders of Harvard College, in settling its constitution and guarding the purity of its faith, seem generally to have followed existing precedents. In respect to religion, however, they adopted a new language. The youth, according to the first two charters, were to be educated “in piety, morality and learning,” and “in knowledge and godliness.” If we are not mistaken, there is here a kind of phraseology extremely diverse from that to be found in the charter of any other literary institution in the British dominions of that age. President Quincy, indeed, supposes that “piety” and “godliness” are words so abstract and general in their signification, as to be “of all others the least susceptible of being wrested to projects merely sectarian.” But it should be remembered, that in 1642 and for many years afterwards, these words were far from having any transcendental meaning ; and whoever, at that time, in England, should have talked of “piety” and “godliness” in reference to colleges and universities, would immediately have been recognized as a puritan of the straitest sect. . There is a remark in the report on another subject of a committee of the board of Overseers of Harvard College in 1727, a part of which applies so well to this case, that we cannot express our own views better than by quoting a single sentence from it. The committee say : “It is a most clear, undeniable and universal rule, that the signification of terms must be decided in every country

according to the known and general acceptance of them, in the several countries where they are used ; and laws must needs be explained according to the general use of the terms in the places where they are made, in the times when they are enacted, and agreeably to the known principles of the legislators.* Apply the principle here asserted to the terms in question ; and who, recollecting the character of the first puritans of Massachusetts, can for a moment doubt, that in the language of these charters, "piety" and "godliness" are to be interpreted in a restricted sense ? The founders of Harvard College used these words as they understood them ? If they had been inquired of what "piety" and "godliness" meant, in all probability they would have answered by repeating the whole of Calvin's Institutes ; and if this failed to give satisfaction, they would have added "Ames's Medulla," with copious illustrations from the same author's "Cases of Conscience."

But not to insist on the meaning to be attached to the terms "piety" and "godliness" in these charters, it is certain that the founders of Harvard College were firm believers in what was considered the orthodox faith ; and it will require very full proof to satisfy the minds of common inquirers, that they were willing to leave it in their new institution without all the protection and support which they could devise. That they did give it every safeguard which they thought necessary to render it perpetual is, we think, obvious from the constitution of their board of visitation. It was here that they placed their confidence in making their theological system permanent. In England they had seen literary, religious and charitable foundations under the supervision of the Archbishop of Canterbury or York, or of the bishop of the diocese in which any such foundation was placed, and these establishments were thought in this way to be secure from perversion. In their case they had no archbishop or bishop to place over their college, to keep it in the straight path ; but they appear to have thought that they had found a regulating and controlling power fully equivalent in the whole body, at that time, of the congregational clergy of the colony.

Considering the circumstances of Massachusetts at the time of which we are treating, the general agreement of the clergy in their system of belief, their rigid Calvinism, and the sacri-

fices they had made to establish themselves in America, and with such precedents as have been mentioned for their guides, is there any reason to wonder at the course which they adopted? What ground was there to apprehend, in the view of that generation, that an institution under such supervision would ever waver in its creed? Undoubtedly individuals acknowledged the right of private judgment in religion; but the great body of the community at the same time maintained, that this right was not to be so exercised as to disturb the state of things in Massachusetts. This is evident from their acts. What was done in the case of Mr. Wheelright, Ann Hutchinson, Roger Williams, the Quakers and Anabaptists need not be repeated here. President Quincy himself says, that the "influence [of the clergy] over the statesmen of the colony was second to none the world ever witnessed. The religion of both was not so much coincident as identical." Without doubt Moses and Aaron walked hand in hand in the proceedings now alluded to, and were entirely agreed in the great religious and political measures of the colony. And when we are further told by the author, that "both were well apprized of the advantages resulting to worldly power from the possession and control of the seminaries of education," is it possible, while they were waging a war of extermination against Antinomians, Quakers and Anabaptists, that they were devising such a constitution for their college, as would allow it to pass readily, as the case might be, under the control of these very sects, and were, in truth, endeavoring "to assure the enjoyment of equal privileges to every religious sect or party;" and were "establishing a seminary of learning, in favor of which they were desirous to unite all the varieties of religious belief?" We cannot but think that the author has here made too heavy a draft on the faith, not to say the credulity, of the reader.

We are told, that the "clergy of that early period were—eminently a practical body of men." This is true; and being such, they contrived a security for the continuance of their faith in the college as strong perhaps as human wisdom could devise; they kept the supervision of the institution in their own hands. After the experience of more than two centuries, it would be difficult, if it were now proposed to establish a creed for all future time, to contrive a method of attaining such an object more effectual, than that actually formed and adopted by the puritans of Massachusetts. At least, we could

name several recent institutions in our country, where men of no common sagacity have employed themselves in devising the surest mode of perpetuating their own faith ; and the result has been an organization not differing materially in principle from that originally framed for Harvard College. President Quincy appears to entertain the opinion, that whatever, in a college, is secured by charter, must be permanent. This is not said in so many words, but the course of his argument seems to imply it. But, that the provisions of a college charter are unalterable, is not in our view a self-evident proposition. We could wish that the author had more fully investigated this point, as the consideration of it might have led to some conclusions, which have now escaped him.

The extraordinary catholicism, which President Quincy has claimed for the founders of Harvard College, has something in it paradoxical even in his own view. " We should expect," he says, " on opening the several charters of this university, to find it, with certainty, anchored head and stern, secure against wind, tide and current, moored firmly on all the points which, at that day, were deemed fixed and immutable." We agree with the author, that this expectation is the only one which can be rationally formed ; and on inquiry no disappointment follows. The most unqualified Calvinism was introduced into the college for the purpose of promoting " piety" and " godliness," two prominent objects of the establishment, and the whole institution was placed under the care of a body of clergy thoroughly Calvinistic, men as confident that, on all the great points of theology, such points as were then considered great, they were *right*, and that all who materially differed from them were *wrong*, as the world ever saw. They erected one of the strongest barriers, in their apprehension, to the introduction of what they thought heresies ; they themselves guarded the avenue to their entrance. If, in the progress of time, the good ship's fastenings have proved to be of less firm materials than was supposed, and violent winds have assailed it from a quarter from which no tempest was feared, and it has been driven somewhat from its first station, this is nothing more than a new instance of the fallibility of human judgment in adapting means to an end. But the failure of a scheme to attain some of its objects is no proof that these objects were never contemplated by its projectors. Calvinism may have gradually vanished from Harvard, but the founders notwithstanding may

have done whatever they thought necessary, or whatever they could have done, to perpetuate it.

That the conclusion of the author, respecting the liberal views of the founders of the university at Cambridge, is not warranted by his premises, will appear still more clearly from a reference to the two charters of Yale College. Here it is manifest that charters may be very liberal, as language is interpreted by President Quincy, where, he himself being judge, there was little or no liberality, in his sense of the word, in those who procured and acted under them. It should be recollected, likewise, that these charters were granted, one more than half a century, and the other more than a century after the first charter of Harvard; and that in the mean time, new causes of alarm for the safety of orthodoxy had arisen. If any means could be discovered for its security, better for the purpose, than those employed in Massachusetts, we should expect to find them made available in the establishment of a college in Connecticut. But the first charter of Yale College has quite as little in it that is sectarian, to say the least, as either charter of Harvard. The petitioners asked for liberty to found a college, "wherein youth may be instructed in the arts and sciences, who, through the blessing of Almighty God, may be fitted for public employments both in church and civil state." The petition was granted; and the trustees were authorized to "erect, form, direct, order, establish, improve, and, at all times in all suitable ways for the future, to encourage the said school—in such form or manner, and under such order and rules, as to them shall seem meet, and most conducive *to the aforesaid end thereof*, so as such rules or orders be not repugnant to the laws of the civil government." Here is no mention of even "piety" or "godliness." It is true that the legislature speak of the petitioners as persons zealous "for upholding and propagating the Christian Protestant religion by a succession of learned and orthodox men," but this clause liberally interpreted, need not qualify the petition itself. It should be recollected also, that the question was distinctly considered by the founders of Yale College, whether the study of the "Assembly's Catechism" and "Ames's Medulla" should be required by a provision of the charter, and decided in the negative. Here we would ask, in passing, had such a question arisen among the first trustees of Harvard and been decided as it was at Yale, would not President Quincy have considered such a fact conclusive in determining the catholic

views of those trustees and their freedom from all sectarian bias? In the charter of Yale College granted by the legislature in 1745, which placed the seminary in many respects on a new foundation, and greatly enlarged its privileges, there is no allusion whatever to the subject of religion, except that in the preamble it is declared, that the institution had "trained up many worthy persons for the service of God, in the state as well as in the church." It is likewise worthy of remark, that in this charter of 1745 there is a reference in the preamble to the object of the original founders, which is stated to have been the establishment of "a collegiate school within this colony, wherein youth might be instructed in the arts and sciences." Religion, if it have any place here, is included under the general designation of "arts and sciences." Adopting President Quincy's mode of reasoning we should infer that catholicism, at this time, was very rife in Connecticut, and that it had greatly increased in the preceding forty-five years; yet the truth undoubtedly is, that in 1745 there was less of a disposition in Connecticut to favor sectaries, than at any period of its history either before or since. It also deserves attention that the charter of 1745 was drafted by President Clap, a graduate of Harvard, whose orthodoxy, there early rooted and nurtured, grew with his growth and strengthened with his strength; and who certainly would have introduced into this charter some provision to secure the prevalence of Calvinistic tenets in the college, if he had thought such a measure necessary for his purpose; or rather, if he had not supposed that the same object was fully attained in a different manner.

From all these considerations, which might be much more fully illustrated, we are clearly of the opinion, that the conclusion drawn by President Quincy, from the two first charters of Harvard College, as to the catholicism of its founders, is wholly incorrect. So far were they from entertaining any such views of liberality as are now prevalent, and designedly arranging the institution for the free and unrestrained use of all sects of Christians indiscriminately, that it is obvious from these very charters that they cherished sentiments directly opposite, and did all that they thought necessary, perhaps all that they could do, to secure the ascendancy of their own theological system in all succeeding times. We think, likewise, that it is most manifest,—and to prove this was our sole object in this inquiry,—that the contrast which President Quincy has drawn between the views

of the founders of Harvard and the founders of Yale is not supported by any facts which he has produced. Reasoning on his own principles from the language of the charters, the balance of catholicism is perhaps in favor of Connecticut. But no sentiments of liberality in religion, such as are now prevalent, were at all countenanced by the founders of Yale. They looked, without doubt, exclusively to the predominance of their own system of faith; and in this respect they differed not in the least, as we believe, from the founders of Harvard.

A second proof of the catholicism of the founders of Harvard College, President Quincy finds in the fact, as he states it, that the "first two presidents, and the only ones appointed by the early emigrants, were known unbelievers in points of religious faith to which the congregational clergy of that time rigidly adhered."* Dunster, he says, was "an avowed antipedobaptist; yet he was chosen and continued president of the seminary fourteen years." Here the plain implication is, and it is essential to the argument, that Dunster was known to be an opponent of infant baptism at the time of his election; which, so far as we know, is supported by no authority. The account given of this matter by Mather is, that Dunster "continued the president of Harvard College, until his unhappy entanglement in the snares of anabaptism." The meaning of this language is obvious; Dunster became an anabaptist a short time only before he left his office. The corporation and overseers, according to the same author, "did, as quietly as they could, procure his removal." If we have the facts correctly, what is there in this transaction, which proves any uncommon liberality in the authorities of the college? The case in short was this. President Dunster declared himself against infant baptism, and in consequence was obliged to resign his office. There is an occurrence parallel to this in the history of Yale College. In 1722, Rector Cutler publicly announced that he had become convinced of the invalidity of Presbyterian ordination; and that he should soon embark for England to obtain orders in the Episcopal church. On hearing this, the trustees voted to "excuse the Rev. Mr. Cutler from all further service." We have no doubt, that under the circumstances both President Dunster and Rector Cutler were rightly removed from their places. It is true that we have not been in the habit of considering the

* Vol. I. p. 47.

removal of Rector Cutler from office a very striking proof of the liberality of the trustees who effected it; nor, on the contrary, considering all the relations of the parties to each other and to the public, do we see in it proof of their illiberality. If, however, the transaction at Cambridge affords evidence of catholicism, that at New Haven, we maintain, does the same.

President Chauncy, the immediate successor of Dunster, is supposed in his connection with Harvard College to furnish a striking exhibition of the liberal spirit of the early trustees. According to President Quincy, he "was not less heretical than his predecessor." His heresy, we are told, "consisted in this, that whereas the prevailing faith among the emigrants was, that in baptism *a sprinkling was sufficient*, the faith of President Chauncy was, according to the historian Hubbard, that *the infant should be washed all over*." That the opinion here ascribed to President Chauncy was ever considered "heresy," in New England, is new to us. That immersion has been thought unnecessary, and in certain circumstances improper and dangerous, is true; but it has been, we believe, universally admitted to be a legitimate mode of baptism. The case of President Chauncy was briefly this. He entertained the opinion ascribed to him above. The trustees thought the matter of so much importance, though they could not have viewed the opinion heretical, that they enjoined upon him absolute silence respecting it, during his continuance in the presidency; he thought it of so little importance that he was willing to comply with the requisition. As to any liberality on the part of the trustees in this adjustment of the conflicting opinions of themselves and the president, we are obliged to confess, though it may be at the hazard of being thought to have very little discernment, that after a faithful trial we have been unable to discover it. In the history of Yale College we find nothing which bears a near resemblance to this transaction.

The original seal of Harvard College is thought by President Quincy to furnish additional illustration of its "early independence of a sectarian spirit." He says: "At the first meeting of the governors of the college, after the first charter was obtained, on the 27th of December 1643, a college seal was adopted, having, as at present, three open books on the field of an heraldic shield, with the motto '*Veritas*' inscribed. The books were probably intended to represent the Bible; and the motto to intimate, that in the Scriptures alone important truth

was to be sought and found, and not in the words of man's devising." To judge correctly of the real meaning of abstract words or phrases employed as a motto on any device, the known sentiments of the individuals who use them, and the character of the times when they were introduced, ought to be taken into consideration. The remark we have already quoted, from the report of a committee of the board of Overseers of Harvard College, applies here in its full force. What is there said of the interpretation of laws is true also of the interpretation of mottos and inscriptions. A writer would be thought to reason very inconsequentially, who from the "seal of the fisherman" should argue, without further inquiry, the humility of the Roman pontiffs. If Peter the disciple could be proved to have engraved on his seal, if he ever had one, an image of himself drawing a net full of fishes, we should infer that originally such a picture simply indicated the employment of him who devised it. If one of those who have acted as his successors first made use of this emblem, some centuries after the death of the disciple, we should have no doubt that it was intended to shadow forth the character, power and prerogatives of "Christ's vicegerent on earth." "Veritas," if found on a seal of some modern transcendentalists, we should suppose, might mean "any thing;" if used in a similar way by the same speculatists in connection with the Scriptures, we should be much at a loss what was intended; the most probable conclusion would be, that it meant "nothing." As used by the early puritans of Massachusetts, "Veritas" placed over the Scriptures, interpreted on the same principles, can mean nothing less than the whole system of revealed truth, as they understood it. In still further explaining this seal according to the principles and usages of the age when it was devised, the three Bibles should seem to refer to the three persons of the Trinity, all concerned, as the puritans believed, in publishing "truth" to men. We can hardly imagine how John Cotton would marvel to see this puritanical, and, as he must have viewed it, highly orthodox seal, entirely modernized in its import, and displayed both inside and out of these volumes.

But we are told by the author that the motto was probably intended to intimate, "that in the Scriptures alone important truth is to be sought and found, and *not in the words of man's devising.*" Thus much, we agree, is very obvious, except what is contained in the last clause. That the very men who,

in the Synod of 1648, consented to the Westminster Confession "for the substance thereof," judging "it to be very holy, orthodox and judicious in all matters of faith," designed to intimate by the emblem on their seal, any opposition to adopting "words of man's devising," in stating religious doctrines, we never should have suspected, much less discovered, without the aid here furnished.

But to satisfy the author how little weight the argument for the early catholicism of Harvard College, derived from its seal, really possesses, we would state the fact, that the seal of Yale College, and the only one ever used by that institution, bears on a shield a *single* representation of the Scriptures, with the Hebrew words *Urim* and *Thummim*, surrounded by the motto "Lux et Veritas." Perhaps the first idea of this emblem was suggested by the early seal of Harvard. We have no other ground for this supposition than the uniform deference paid by Yale, for many years, to the older seminary; and the proneness of the trustees to look to Harvard on most occasions for examples and precedents, where any thing new was contemplated. However this may be, no one we presume can doubt that "Lux et Veritas" on the seal of Yale College is a motto which, besides its reference to the Hebrew, indicates much the same things as are taught in the "Westminster Confession" and "Ames's Medulla."

In connection with this subject, President Quincy advances an opinion, which, as much as any thing else he has said, is opposed to all our previous impressions. "It is possible," he remarks, "nay, even probable, that the reason of the entire absence of any reference to points of religious faith in the charters of the college was, that these early emigrants could not agree concerning them among themselves, and preferred silence on such points to engaging in controversy, when establishing a seminary of learning, in favor of which they were desirous to unite all the varieties of religious belief."* We suppose that in those charters there is a general reference to points of religious faith; and in looking for the reasons why the subject is not treated more in detail, we had arrived at directly the opposite conclusion to that contained in the above extract. We had become settled in the opinion that this fact is to be attributed, among other causes, to the almost absolute agree-

* Vol. I. p. 50.

ment of the founders of the college in all the important points of their creed. When churches and communities are agreed in their religious views, there is little occasion for drawing up creeds and confessions. It is when great diversity of opinion exists, and party zeal is active, that such formularies are produced. The Nicene and Athanasian creeds did not first appear in times of great quiet in the church, when all thought the same thing. The church of Rome had no full and extended symbol of faith before the Reformation. The controversies arising out of this rupture in the church led to the decrees of the council of Trent, and to the various attempts among the different classes of Protestants, to define wherein they differed from the church of Rome, and from each other. The assent given to the Westminster Confession by the Synod at Cambridge in 1648, we had supposed, was a measure taken to satisfy their friends in England of the soundness of the faith of the New England churches, rather than to answer any call from among themselves; and that the proceedings of the Synod of 1680 originated in part from the same general cause.

As to the actual agreement of the first clergy of Massachusetts, and consequently of the founders of Harvard College, in one system of faith respecting all points by them considered essential, they have given, in addition to what appears in their synodical acts, all the testimony in their other proceedings, which could be desired for our satisfaction. They adopted at first for the college, as we have seen, a course of theological study, made up of pure unadulterated Calvinism. This course was continued, we do not find in this history how long, but undoubtedly for more than a century. Who at first, or for a long time after the college was founded, complained of this course? What evidence is there, that the approbation of it, to the close of the seventeenth century and through a quarter or a half of the eighteenth, was not universal? So late, certainly, as 1722, when the first Hollis Professor of Divinity was inducted into office, the candidate was examined by the corporation,—whether they had a right so to do, it is not to our purpose to inquire,—“upon several important heads of divinity.” At this examination, “he declared his assent,” among other things, to “Dr. Ames’s *Medulla Theologiæ*,” and “to the Confession of Faith contained in the Assembly’s Catechism.” Two of the four examiners were President Leverett and Dr. Colman, both represented as distinguished for their liberality, and the latter

as "the recognized leader of the most liberal religious party of the province."* "Ames's Medulla" and the "Westminster Catechism," then, were standards in theology in Massachusetts so late as 1722, universally admitted to be such; for if "the most liberal religious party of the province" adhered to them, there can be no question about all others. Now if, in 1722, "Ames's Medulla" and the "Westminster Catechism" were united in by all, can there be any doubt that they are correct symbols of the faith of the Massachusetts clergy in 1650? And is it possible, that the difference of theological views among the clergy in 1650 was so great as to be an obstacle in the way to making these summaries of Christian doctrine the standards of faith in the college? Our theory is, that the general agreement in theological opinions, in 1650, as evidenced by the result of the synod two years before, would render, in the view of the clergy of that time, any attempt to frame a creed for the college a work of supererogation; especially, as before stated, they must have believed their faith established in Harvard, through the board of Overseers, beyond the chances of essential variation. They seem never to have anticipated a general defection in their own body.

There were, we do not deny, controversies from the first among the clergy of Massachusetts on points of theology; but these did not materially affect the two standards so often mentioned. In the long conflict of words, "Ames's Medulla" and the "Westminster Confession" stood firm. Nothing, perhaps, could prove more absolutely, how little difference about points of faith there was among the clergy of Massachusetts down to the beginning of the eighteenth century, than the attempt by President Quincy to prove the existence of a great revolution in theology about that time in the establishment of the Brattle-street church in Boston. The founding of the church in Brattle Square, President Quincy represents as "the first-fruit of that religious liberty, which the charter of William and Mary introduced into Massachusetts."† The associates of this church, he says, "were generally men of known character and weight in the province; and they reckoned in their number, and among their friends, individuals distinguished for learning, private worth, exemplary piety and official station." We are prepared to expect some momentous changes. But what is the

* Vol I. p. 336.

SECOND SERIES, VOL. VI. NO. II.

† Vol. I. p. 132.

result ? What was accomplished to make the end of the seventeenth and the beginning of the eighteenth century an era in the ecclesiastical history of Massachusetts ? "Thomas Brattle took the lead in forming an association of enlightened and pious Christians in Boston, for the purpose of establishing there a new Congregational church, constituted on principles deviating from the Platform, and expressly rejecting *the imposition of any public relation of experiences*, or any other examination than by the pastor, as the condition of admission to the Lord's Supper." A very lame conclusion. Not one article of faith is touched. It turns out that a "public relation of experiences" was not required. But the author might have added that the church say in their "Manifesto," "if any one think himself bound in conscience to make such a relation, let him do it."*

We cannot but remark here, that it seems a little strange that the rule adopted by the church in Brattle Square respecting the public relation of experiences should be an augury of the bright day of liberality in Massachusetts, when nearly the same rule was adopted by Thomas Hooker more than sixty years before, in his church at Hartford ;† to which place he and his congregation had come, as will be recollected, according to President Quincy, that they might be under a "stricter form of worship." That Dr. Colman and the new church adhered to the common faith of the churches of Massachusetts is proved from the "Manifesto" which they issued. They made a public annunciation of their "principles and rules," to which they intended "by God's grace to adhere." "First of all," they say, "we approve and subscribe the Confession of Faith put forth by the Assembly of Divines at Westminster." There seems to have been no hesitation about subscribing "words of man's devising ;" there is not even the saving clause of "substance of doctrine." If President Quincy had noticed this part of the "Manifesto," he would have seen, we think, how little the church in Brattle Square differed from the other churches in Boston ; and the want of any allusion to it, we consider a serious defect in his account of the formation of this church,

* See Dr. Palfrey's sermon to the church in Brattle Square, July 18th, 1824, in which, and the accompanying documents, the history of this church appears to be fully and impartially given.

† Magnalia, Life of Thomas Hooker.

considered as history. The liberality of Dr. Colman is so often commended in this work, that some, probably, would be pleased to see more particularly what was thought to be liberal theology in the first half of the eighteenth century. The following passage, from Dr. Palfrey's sermon before referred to, may gratify a very natural curiosity. "Dr. Colman was attached to the Genevan doctrine, as, with his parentage and subsequent connections, it would have been wonderful if he had not been. But he seemed to have outstripped his age, and to have risen almost to the ground of that venerable race of men now nearly extinct, which within the last century have borne the name of *moderate Calvinists*." The preservation of orthodoxy appears to have been an object of his solicitude. When Yale College "received the *Dean's Bounty*," says Dr. Palfrey, "Dr. Colman was alarmed, lest the benefaction should be coupled with conditions adverse to the purity of the churches, and wrote letters to the rector and some of the trustees, cautioning them to beware of making concessions to episcopacy. In one of these letters, he inquires concerning the truth of a report, that Arminianism had gained ground in that college." The detail, furnished by President Quincy of controversies arising out of the formation of the church of Brattle Square, shows no departure in any quarter from the common faith. The "Westminster Confession" was not infringed upon. There was great uniformity of belief, we are fully persuaded, not only among the early clergy of Massachusetts, but for a long time among their successors.

We pass now to another topic. About the year 1718, and for a few years after, some attempts were made to procure funds for Yale College, which are represented by President Quincy in a very unfavorable light. It does not, indeed, appear from the narrative, that any of the authorities of the college were directly concerned in these transactions; but as some or all of the trustees were not improbably acquainted with them, and may have afforded the agents their aid and countenance, it seems necessary to inquire what was really done, and how far the conduct of those implicated deserves censure. Especially is it incumbent on us to pay this subject some attention, since we find Governor Saltonstall,—who, in addition to his other excellences of character, possessed, as we had always supposed, a disposition remarkably frank, noble and generous,—represented as

favoring an "underhand"* proceeding, if he was not himself personally engaged in it.

The first attempt of this kind in favor of Yale College, which is thought by the author exceptionable, was made by Cotton Mather. It seems that in 1718 he wrote to Governor Yale, praising him for his "overflowing liberalities to objects on this side of the Atlantic," and, extolling his disposition to do good, he "bespeaks his favor for a people who are sound and generous Christians and Protestants, having a college at Saybrook, Connecticut;" and intimates to him that his munificence to it might "obtain for it the name of Yale College, which would be better than the name of sons and daughters;—a seminary," he adds, "from whence a good people expect the supply of all their synagogues." This is President Quincy's account of the matter; and he subjoins the remark: "From the temper of his mind at this time, it cannot be questioned that he meant that Mr. Yale should understand that Harvard College was not such a seminary." We do not suppose ourselves under very strong obligations to defend Cotton Mather. He may, at the time of writing this letter, have entertained unfriendly feelings towards Harvard; yet on the face of the communication we see nothing which necessarily implies hostility to that college. Governor Yale had begun to make donations to the college in Connecticut as early as 1714. As the college was about to be removed to New Haven, as Mather probably supposed, and it had in fact been removed at the date of his letter, and as Governor Yale was a native of New Haven and was aware of the intention of the trustees, Mather appears to have judged it a favorable time to incite him to some greater act of beneficence. Nothing is apparent, from which it can be inferred that he was induced to write this letter by any one immediately connected with the college of Connecticut. This active and busy divine was not disposed to withhold his services, whenever he thought they might be acceptable; and this may have been a "labor of love," to which he needed no prompting from others. As to the expression, that the good people of Connecticut expected from their new college "the supply of all their synagogues," it is not so clear to us as it seems to be to President Quincy, that the writer intended to cast any reproach on Harvard. It is

* Vol. I. p. 227.

undoubtedly true that there was an expectation, that graduates of the college just instituted would in time become extensively the pastors of churches in Connecticut, as actually occurred; and this with the best feelings towards the older seminary. This natural anticipation is all probably which Mather intended to express, though his language, as is common in epistolary writing, may be a little too unqualified. His vanity, certainly, is apparent in his letter written soon after to Governor Saltonstall, —an extract from which President Quincy has furnished. That Mather's interference, however, was of any injury to Harvard, or service to Yale, we see no evidence whatever. That he was influenced in what he did solely by motives of resentment against his own college, in the exercise of that liberality which is sometimes called charity, we are slow to believe.

But the great transgression was in the following year. In 1719, Thomas Hollis began a series of donations to Harvard College alike honorable to himself and to that institution. When the disposition of Hollis to patronize a college in New England was known, Mr. Jeremiah Dummer, colonial agent, in September of the same year, sent for Mr. Hollis to meet him at a coffee-house in London, to show him a letter, and "to acquaint him about a college building at New Haven, and proposing it for his bounty." Hollis, it seems, did not receive this application with much favor. In the February following, 1720, Dummer brought to Hollis another letter dated the July preceding, "handsomely worded but no name to it, recommending to him the collegiate school at New Haven." This letter came inclosed in one from Governor Saltonstall, "earnestly pressing the same affair." In 1721, Hollis received two other "anonymous letters about Yale College." All these attempts to enlist Hollis in the support of the new institution in Connecticut were unavailing. The anonymous letter forwarded by Governor Saltonstall is supposed by President Quincy to have been written by Cotton Mather, and he adduces several reasons for his belief. To determine whether this was really so is not necessary for our object. As to any thing which we have in view, the alleged authorship of the letter or letters may be affirmed or denied. The only question with which we are concerned is, whether this request to Hollis implies any design or wish on the part of those who made it, "to turn the bounty of Thomas Hollis from Cambridge into the New Haven channel." This is what is alleged by President Quincy. It is readily ad-

mitted, that less wisdom appears in the mode of application, so far as the circumstances of the case are disclosed, than we should have expected from Governor Saltonstall. Hollis seems to have taken offence that an anonymous letter should have been sent him ; and this occurrence was probably of itself sufficient to defeat the object, if he had otherwise been disposed to favor it. Governor Saltonstall and his anonymous coadjutor probably relied chiefly for success on what they considered the reasonableness of their request ; and thought little of the manner in which it was preferred. If they had known more of the character of Hollis, the course pursued in approaching him might have been very different. But where is the proof, that it entered into the plan of Governor Saltonstall and Cotton Mather, if he was indeed the author of the anonymous letter, to benefit Yale at the expense of Harvard ? To us such a conclusion appears altogether too remote from the premises. All which is shown by the correspondence, or can be clearly inferred from the circumstances is, that the friends of Yale College had learned what Hollis was doing for Harvard ; and concluded it possible, on a fair representation of the necessities of the college in Connecticut, that he might be prevailed upon to do something for that likewise. How could they know that he intended to limit his benefactions to one institution ? They might not unreasonably infer the probability that he had determined on giving Harvard a certain sum, and without diminishing it might also aid them in their enterprise. At least, there is no obvious reason why they might not bring their case before him for his consideration. If there was any error in the proceedings in this matter in Connecticut, it is found in the repetition of the application in 1721. But there may have been some grounds for this which are now unknown. Who were concerned in making this final request of Hollis is not said. That there was any thing in the whole of the transaction which can fairly be found fault with, even by the most scrupulous, has not been shown, except perhaps in the case of the anonymous letters, and this, at most, was a mere indiscretion. That there was a design or wish to do any thing which might prejudice the interests of Harvard, is not only not proved, but is not rendered in a slight degree probable. This supposition ought not to be entertained without some direct and positive proof.

Such would be our conclusion, whoever had been the actors in this business. But when we ask, who is the responsible

person, no name is given, except on conjecture, but that of Governor Saltonstall. It was he who communicated the anonymous letter. If Cotton Mather, or whoever was the author of it, preferred a petition adverse to Harvard, Governor Saltonstall was accessory to the wrong. President Quincy very properly remarks, "that Governor Saltonstall would hardly have consented to have been the medium of an anonymous letter, unless he had known the author to be of some weight of character," and we would add, unless he had fully understood the design of this "underhand mover;" as he inclosed the anonymous letter in one written by himself, "earnestly pressing the same affair."

Now, in what relation does Governor Saltonstall stand to Harvard College? He died in 1724, and by will left that college one hundred pounds. His wife, Mary Saltonstall, had given that college an equal sum the year before; and afterwards in her will added to this benefaction one thousand pounds. It is not unreasonable to presume,—it may be considered as certain,—that with respect to this latter bequest, there was an understanding between Governor Saltonstall and his wife before his death. In 1717, Governor Saltonstall and his wife gave to Yale College each fifty pounds. Their joint donations, therefore, to Harvard and Yale, are as twelve to one. In view of these facts, we would ask, is it credible, or rather, on the common principles of human action, is it possible that in 1720,—and the dates should be particularly noticed,—Governor Saltonstall was conspiring with Cotton Mather or any one else, who was endeavoring in an "underhand way" "to turn the bounty of Thomas Hollis from Cambridge into the New Haven channel?" We fully believe that there has been some strange oversight in preparing the account of this matter. We are wholly unable to persuade ourselves that President Quincy on so slight grounds, or, as we think, no grounds at all, would willingly hold up one of the principal benefactors of Harvard, and one, who "in the attributes of public spirit and benevolence was not surpassed by any of his contemporaries," to censure and reproach.

(To be concluded.)

ARTICLE VII.

CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN PROF. M. STUART AND DR. I. NORDHEIMER, ON THE USE AND OMISSION OF THE HEBREW ARTICLE IN SOME IMPORTANT PASSAGES OF SCRIPTURE.

To Dr. I. Nordheimer.

MY DEAR SIR :

THE copy of your Hebrew Syntax, which you forwarded to me, has been received, and I have perused it with much interest and satisfaction. I am specially gratified with the *simplicity* of method, which for the most part is exhibited in its developments. Everywhere it bears the marks of *eigene Forschung* as well as of *eiserne Fleiss*, i. e. of original and personal efforts in investigation, as well as of the untiring diligence with which this has been pursued. I have been particularly struck with the appositeness and lucid order of your examples, which are cited to illustrate and confirm your positions. They are plainly, for the most part, the result of your own reading and research; and they carry along with them a weight of evidence, which will very generally compel the belief and secure the confidence of the intelligent student. If you have not done every thing which is to be done in this department of labor, this is no reproach, and nothing derogatory to your work. It is not for any one man to do all, in this department, which is to be done. That individual deserves hearty thanks from those that study the Old Testament Scriptures, who makes any improvement upon the old arrangement of the syntax, gives a more satisfactory elucidation of any part of it, or contributes something new to the treasures already collected. In my judgment you are entitled to credit in each of these respects; and this is saying as much as you could wish me to say.

But it is no part of my present object to *review* your book; for inasmuch as I am myself before the public in the capacity of a Hebrew grammarian, it would hardly be delicate for me to undertake such a task. I have a different object in view, on the present occasion, and one which I will proceed to unfold without further introduction or delay.

One of the first chapters, which I read in your Syntax, was that which respects the *Article*. The reason of this was, that I had been engaged in some investigations, where the question respecting the *absence* and the *presence* of the article seemed to become *fundamental*, as to the true meaning of the sacred text. My mind had been not a little perplexed with the subject; and after all, I had not been able wholly to free myself from this perplexity. Gesenius, Ewald, Vater, and (of course) the older grammarians had not solved my doubts, nor proffered me any clue to which I could confidently intrust myself. You may imagine, then, with what interest I took up your work, knowing that you had been making new investigations, and hoping that by some of these my darkness would be dissipated.

I am not certain, however, whether any of the principles which you have developed respecting the article will reach to the satisfactory solution of my doubts. If it be a fact, that the application of any of the principles exhibited in your book will solve them, you will of course have an opportunity, in answering my questions, to show how this may be done. Believing you to be sincerely desirous of exhibiting the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, in regard to any matter of grammar, or any principle of philology, which you have occasion to discuss, I proceed, without further apology or preface, to state my difficulties, and to ask your attention to the subject, and that you will lay the results of your investigation before the public, that they, as well as myself may be profited by your labors.

After all that has been said and written on Is. 7: 14, "A virgin shall conceive and bear a son," there remains some difficulty in the mind of every sober, unbiassed and independent investigator. This difficulty has respect, so far as my own mind is concerned, to the *article* in מְלֵצָה, which seems to demand that we should translate *the virgin*, not *a virgin* (which would be מְלֵצָה). Certainly the common principles of Hebrew syntax, in respect to the article, would demand such a version. What is there that will lead, or even permit us to dispense with this demand?

In answer to this, I am well aware that it is easy to produce a great number of cases, where the Hebrew article is employed, while the corresponding sentiment in our idiom will not admit the insertion of our definite article. For example; in a multitude of cases where the ׀ of similitude is prefixed to nouns,

and these nouns mostly take the article in Hebrew; e. g. Ps. 49: 15, *They are laid in the grave* בַּצֹּאֵן, lit. *like the sheep*, which in English would be an offence against the common laws of idiom, for we invariably say, in such general comparisons, *like sheep*. So Deut. 1: 44, *They chased you* כְּחֹדְכֵיכֶם . . . , *as the bees do*; Is. 40: 31, *They shall mount up* כְּנֹשָׁרִים, *as the eagles*; and so in a countless number of examples. So also with the *singular* number, as well as with the plural; e. g. Hos. 14: 6, *I will be to Israel* כְּטֶל, *as the dew*; Hos. 14: 7, *His savor shall be* כְּלִבְנוֹן, *as the Lebanon*; Hos. 14: 8, *And they shall blossom* כְּגִפְתָּן, *as the vine*. In such cases, our English idiom sometimes would admit, and sometimes reject, the article; for we might say *as the dew, as the vine*, but not *as the Lebanon*. Yet it would be equally well to say in the former cases, *as dew, as a vine*.

I do not adduce cases like these, in order to show that the use of the article in הַעֲלָמָה can be accounted for by them, but merely to show that the Hebrew language, in the use of the article, not unfrequently differs very palpably from the English. This fact being established, it remains only to be ascertained, how far this discrepancy goes, and whether the cases which have occasioned my present inquiries belong to those which can be illustrated by such means or in this manner.

But before I proceed to further remarks, permit me to inquire whether the metes and bounds of the article after the כ of similitude can be fixed with certainty? Gesenius (Lex.) says that the use of the article in such a case is *longe frequentissimus*; but when the noun joined with such a כ is followed by another word which makes it definite, then the article is *omitted*. This last circumstance you have failed to notice in § 720, II. 2, a. It however not only requires notice, but the numerous cases which do not come under either of these rubrics, viz., cases where the כ of similitude is followed by a noun not made definite and which is also *anarthrous*, (cases that are not unfrequent, and which I have often noticed,) require a particular and thorough investigation. I would respectfully suggest this as one of the topics which demands further investigation, and one concerning which Hebrew grammar yet leaves us in the dark.—But to my immediate purpose.

As more like הַעֲלָמָה are we to regard such cases as 1 Sam. 17: 34, *And there came* הָאֵרֶץ וְהַדָּבָר, *the lion and the bear*; where we must say in English, *a lion and a bear*. An example

of the same tenor, and with the same words, is also found in Amos 5: 19. Here *some one* of a class of animals is clearly denoted; but not the whole class, for then the designation might naturally take the article. But of this individual *one*, no notice is given in the context; no adjunct has rendered it definite to the mind of a reader; and what was there to make it so to the mind of even the writer? Of the first example one might say: "The lion and the bear, which so commonly invade the flocks, is meant;" of the second (in Amos), it is difficult to get even so much as this to support it. Is there any thing but *emphasis*, as applied to the designation of some particular individual, which is left to account for the article—an individual, moreover, not distinguished (as is usual when the article is exhibited) from other individuals of the same species, but as distinguished from any individual of another species? If such a use of the article is allowed in Hebrew, it is a peculiar principle, and needs further investigation and illustration. May I invite your attention to the further development of this principle?

After all, how can these cases bear upon הַצִּלְפִּי in Is. 7: 14? If *virgin* here be supposed to mean a *class*, the nature of the context utterly refutes the supposition. It is an *individual* who is to bear an individual child. In what way, then, does the individuality become thus *specific*? How is this one *virgin*, (or *young woman*, if we should even adopt such a translation, with Aquila, Gesenius and others,) distinguished so as to become specific in the view of the prophet, or of those who read him?

Nothing is said in the preceding context respecting her. No account is given of the *when* or *where* of her existence in the sequel. How then are we to account for the use of the *article*? What has been recently said in respect to it, you are well aware of. Gesenius represents the article here as equivalent to the pronoun adjective *my*, and the prophet as meaning *my young wife*. Others have applied it to a young wife of Ahaz; others to some young woman then in the presence of Ahaz and the prophet, to whom the latter might refer δεικτικῶς, as much as to say: *This young woman*. So far as the mere article is concerned, this might be an easy solution; but what the *extraordinary* and *miraculous* ἰσχύς (*sign*), which the prophet promises could then be, is beyond my comprehension; and this difficulty is enough of itself to render this solution altogether improbable. Even

Paulus, Ewald, and Hitzig reject this; and Ewald has proposed a principle (Kleine Gramm. s. 239) which at least deserves serious examination. He says that “the article is used with nouns that signify a species, in order to designate an individual, and all possible like individuals, of the same species definitely separated or distinguished from other different species.” Translated into common parlance, I suppose this to mean: *Irgend einer* = *aliquis* (but not *quidam*), i. e. some individual of a particular species as distinct from other species. So Hitzig (Comm. on Is. 7: 14) allows the article in such cases to be equivalent to *aliquis*. He appeals to Judg. 14: 6, הַגִּידִי; 1 Kings 20: 36, הָאֲרִיָּה, and 2 Kings 4: 18, הַיּוֹם. If this idea is well founded, is it not an adequate solution of the difficulty before us? The words of the prophet then would run thus: *Behold! some virgin shall conceive*, etc. In this case the article would merely mark an individual which belongs to a class distinct from all other classes. Is this tenable? And if so, will the several examples, such as הַמֶּלֶךְ, הַמֶּלֶכֶת, הַמֶּלֶכֶת, הַמֶּלֶכֶת, etc., suffice to illustrate and establish such a principle? See in Ewald ut supra.

The solution of Hengstenberg (Comm. on Is. 7: 14, in his Christol.), viz., that the article refers to some individual virgin whom the prophet sees in his ecstasy, will hardly satisfy most critical readers of Hebrew. How in such a case could Ahaz attach any intelligible meaning to the article, who could not be conscious of what was passing in the prophet's mind?

The supposition, moreover, that the prophet refers to some virgin of David's race, whom the popular belief had already fixed upon as the mother of a future Deliverer, is destitute of any evidence. Is. 7: 14 contains the first notice we have of the birth of the Deliverer in this peculiar manner.

It is not necessary in answering my questions, to determine whether the Messiah has come, or is yet to come. I do not ask your opinion on this point. It is a mere dark spot in Hebrew Grammar, on which I wish to have more light poured, if more can be poured. That a great Personage is predicted in Is. 7: 14—16, I suppose will not be denied. Be he now who he may—what is the use and intent of the article in הַמֶּלֶכֶת; how is it to be translated; and what must the prophet have designed by affixing it to the noun מֶלֶכֶת? You see I repose much confidence in your candor, as well as ability, in respect to an answer; and on your part, you will be glad that I have ex-

cited you to a more thorough investigation of the doctrine of the Hebrew article. The subject is worth a little book by itself. In my judgment, there remains still "much land in this quarter to be possessed." I do not know who has better opportunity, or more ability, than you to take possession. For one, I shall be truly grateful to you for the effort.

I have now laid before you some of the difficulties with which I have felt myself to be pressed, in regard to מָשִׁיחַ in Is. 7 : 14. Let me next call your attention to another passage, which has been regarded by interpreters as being of equal, or almost equal, importance with this ; although it is nowhere cited and applied to the Messiah by the writers of the New Testament. The words to which I refer are in Dan. 9 : 25 : "Moreover, know thou and understand, that from the going forth of the command to restore and rebuild Jerusalem, עַד מָשִׁיחַ, נָגִיד, *unto the Messiah, the Prince*, shall be seven weeks and threescore and two weeks," etc., as our English version has it. It is a matter of course, that our translators regarded this passage as having reference to *the Messiah* ; and my present inquiry is not, whether you believe or not, that it refers to Jesus of Nazareth ; but whether, by the laws of the Hebrew language, it is admissible here to translate this passage as it now stands in our version, and in nearly all the older versions of modern times ? There is *no article* before *Messiah* or *Prince*, in the original Hebrew. Could the article be omitted, in case the language was intended to designate the Messiah ?

Rosenmueller translates—*ad unctum principem* ; De Wette, in like manner, "*bis auf einen gesalbten Fürsten* ;" and so Hitzig ; i. e. these and many others render the words as meaning *until an anointed Prince* or *Chieftain*. Hengstenberg, who has strenuously defended the *Messianic* meaning of the passage against such a construction, concedes that it should be rendered *an Anointed One, a Prince* ; and he thinks that it was left purposely indefinite, in order to excite the curiosity of readers !

Not contented, however, with this suggestion, he strenuously defends the omission of the article before מָשִׁיחַ, on the ground that it is a *proper name*. Is there any good reason for such an assertion ? What is the usage of the Old Testament in respect to the word מָשִׁיחַ ?

This word occurs thirty-nine times ; and in thirty-two of them it is in regimen with the word Jehovah, or with a pronoun-adjective referring to him. In all these the article is of

course omitted by the usual laws of the language. In four of the remaining cases it has the article; but it has it because it stands in apposition with **הַכֹּהֵן**, *the high-priest*, and is an attributive of this noun; see Lev. 4: 3, 5, 16. 6: 22. In one case, 2 Sam. 1: 21, it is a simple adjective, and is applied to the shield of Saul. The other two cases are before us, viz. in Dan. 9: 25, 26. We have no opportunity, then, to gather much information about the use of the article with **מָשִׁיחַ**, from the *usus loquendi* of the Scriptures.

But as to the assertion, that it is a *proper name* in Dan. 9: 25; on what can this be built? Out of the thirty-nine cases in which the word occurs, twenty-nine of them plainly respect Saul, David, or some other Jewish king; *four* have respect to the high-priest; *two* are of the plural number and are applied to the whole people of Israel; *one* is an adjective applied to the shield of Saul; *one* is applied to Cyrus in Is. 40: 1; and only one instance is to be found, excepting in the verse before us, where **מָשִׁיחַ** is a Messianic title, viz. in Ps. 2: 2. Whence then does Hengstenberg get the evidence, that **מָשִׁיחַ** in Dan. 9: 25 is a *proper name*? It is an appellative merely in itself; and in order to acquire the virtue of a proper name, we must suppose it to have become exceedingly common in the times of Daniel. But where is the evidence of this?

If now the omission of the article before **מָשִׁיחַ** might be accounted for in Hengstenberg's way, yet how can it be accounted for that **נָגִיד** has it not? We cannot say **הָנָגִיד מֶלֶךְ**, but must say **הָנָגִיד הַמֶּלֶךְ**. Why not then **הַנָּגִיד מָשִׁיחַ**?

But this is not all. Is **נָגִיד** a probable *Messianic* designation? Of the forty-two times in which the word is employed in the Old Testament, excluding the passage before us, there are nineteen cases where it means a *leader, overseer*, etc., of a secondary order; in nineteen or twenty it designates a *ruler or king* of the Hebrews; once it designates a *foreign prince*, Ezek. 28: 2. In Job 31: 37, Prov. 29: 16, Dan. 11: 22, the meaning may be contested, but probably it means *chief ruler*.

Why now should Daniel choose a word of such various and even secondary signification, for the designation of the Messiah, when **הַמֶּלֶךְ** would have been the usual, intelligible and appropriate word? And why omit the *article*, which seems to be absolutely demanded by the usual laws of the language? These questions Hengstenberg has not answered; what answer then does Hebrew usage compel us to give?

As to the rendering by *anointed Chieftain*, I cannot see how this is to be defended. If מָשִׁיחַ be an adjective here, it must, from its position, be a *predicate*, and not an attributive. Or if this be not so, where are the examples which will justify such a rendering by Rosenmueller and De Wette?

You see my grammatical and exegetical straits. I wish for more light drawn from the *usus loquendi* of the Scriptures and the nature of the Hebrew idiom, and not for confident assertion or contemptuous scorn of the opinions of all who may differ in their views. I do not wish to draw you into the Messianic question or controversy here, but merely to obtain your opinion, with proofs from Scripture, what the *omission* of the article here must necessarily import. This matter cannot be settled by a mere *en passant* remark, as in Havernick; nor by examples in favor of the rendering *anointed Prince*, such as Rosenmueller gives in his Comm. in locum. All of these seem to me to be capable of another solution, in conformity with the usual custom of the language. I wish for more light; I shall be thankful if you can and will impart it.

I know well it will cost you labor. But I know, also, that you are a real φιλόπονος, and will not shrink from the undertaking on this account. As you have so recently been through the whole of the Hebrew Scriptures in search of examples to illustrate your Syntax, you will the more easily find what I desire, if it is to be found. My state of health, and engagements forbid the requisite labor on my part. May I say to you: *Juniores ad labores?*

I have other questions in regard to the article. Is it true that *poetry* assumes a peculiar license in respect to the *omission* of it? And if so, are there any fixed principles in regard to this? The fact is often asserted by Gesenius and others; but have they noticed with sufficient discrimination the usages of prose?

These and the preceding questions will help to prepare you, if you enter into the discussion of them, for the second edition of your Hebrew Syntax, which, in due time, I doubt not will be demanded.

Believing that you will rightly appreciate the confidence which I have thus signified, by asking these questions, of your knowledge of the Hebrew idiom, and that you will at least give some valuable hints respecting the difficulties proposed, I subscribe myself,

Yours, with respect and kind regard,
Andover, Theol. Sem., June 15, 1841. M. STUART.

To Professor M. Stuart.

DEAR SIR :

I received your letter proposing a correspondence between yourself and me on the use and omission of the Hebrew article in some passages of the Old Testament, and containing some commendatory remarks on the second volume of my Hebrew Grammar. While I thank you for the latter, I undertake with pleasure to answer your inquiries ; although I am not sure of being able to do so to your satisfaction, as, after a close examination of the subject, I do not clearly perceive wherein the passages quoted present greater difficulties with regard to the article than do many others as well in Hebrew as in other languages.

On a careful perusal of your letter, I find that the principal queries it contains are the following two, of a directly opposite nature, concerning the use of the article in the passage *הִנֵּה הַעַלְמָה הָרָה* “ behold a virgin shall conceive,” Is. 7 : 14, and its omission in the passage *עַד מָשִׁיחַ נָגִיד* “ unto the Messiah the Prince,” Dan. 9 : 25 ; besides which a few other queries are cursorily introduced. In my reply I shall confine myself chiefly to these two principal passages, touching upon the others, which are fully discussed and quoted in my Syntax, in the course of my remarks.

But even in regard to the two main queries, as to the use of the article in *הַעַלְמָה*, and its omission in *מָשִׁיחַ נָגִיד*, their solution I think is contained in the principles laid down in my Syntax, in the chapter on the article. As regards the first of them, I have said in § 720. II., “ the article is subjectively prefixed to a common noun by way of emphasis, and to point it out as one which, although neither previously nor subsequently described, is still viewed as definite in the mind of the writer.” And as to the last, I have likewise said, § 718, “ the article, as well as other particles, is sometimes omitted by the poets, who, for the sake of elevating and condensing their expressions, frequently neglect those minute specifications of meaning which the prose writer is required to make.” As these two observations, which are chiefly applicable to poetic compositions, are of an apparently contradictory nature, and as the conciseness of a scientific text-book is not called for on the present occasion, a fuller development of these principles may here not be superfluous.

In the frequent use or entire omission of particles, poetry in

almost every language differs essentially from prose ; because, as this class of vocables are used for the most part merely to indicate the relations of the principal members of a sentence to each other, their use or omission by the poet in particular instances will depend on whether clearness and perspicuity or an emphatic conciseness be his principal aim. Now the prose writer is in general not under the influence of any powerful emotion, nor is his mind raised above the ordinary state of cool deliberation. Consequently in the expression of his ideas he is not governed by his own feelings alone, but consults external circumstances, and is or should be careful to adapt his expressions to his reader's comprehension : so that if a particle be necessary to convey a clear conception of an idea to his reader, he will feel called upon to use it ; and if not, he will omit it. Accordingly, on applying this principle to the Hebrew article, we find that the prose writer omits it where a noun is employed indefinitely or is rendered definite by signification or construction (see Gram. § 717) ; while he uses it, either objectively, i. e. where a noun, being otherwise rendered specific, is definite both to himself and his reader (see § 720. I.), or subjectively, i. e. where he emphatically prefixes the article to the name of an object which he has reason to suppose will be known to the reader without further specification (see § 720. II.).

But such is not the case with the prophet or poet, who, being under the control of powerful and sudden emotions, expresses at once that which divine or poetic inspiration dictates, with less regard than the prose writer for the intellect and previous state of knowledge of his readers. Hence, if a clear indication of some relation between the principal members of a sentence present itself as a prominent consideration to his mind, he will use and even repeat the particle denoting such relation, and that too in cases where the prose writer could omit it altogether as unnecessary ; while at another time a certain relation may stand so plain and obvious before his mind, as to seem to require no specification whatever, and consequently he will omit it, especially when desirous of using a particularly condensed and energetic form of expression,—and this may occur even where his readers may thereby be left in some doubt as to his precise meaning. Now in applying this principle to the passage *הָיָה הַיְצִלָּמָה הָרָח*, the use of the article by the prophet conclusively shows that the person spoken of was definite and specific to his own mind, i. e. that God by inspiration indicated to him the

individual who should “conceive and bear a son;” for which reason he makes use of the definite article; for were he to omit it, and use the term עֶלְמָה alone, he would manifest that he himself did not know to what individual person his prophecy referred. Thus the prophet employs the article to show that the object to which it relates was definite to his own mind, although the neglect of a further specification still leaves room for doubt in the minds of his readers as to the particular person alluded to.

The other examples adduced of the use of the article in cases where it is not employed in English can by no means be classed with the passage Is. 7 : 14, and all admit of a much easier solution. Thus the article is frequently used after the ׁ of similitude by writers both of prose and poetry, in order to give emphasis to the noun the comparison is made with, which usually denotes some well known object (see § 720. I. 2. a.). You here cite a rule laid down by Gesenius in his Lexicon, that the *article after the ׁ of similitude is omitted, when followed by another word which renders it definite*; and kindly remind me that I have failed to notice this circumstance, at the same time stating it as your opinion, *not only that it requires notice, but that the numerous cases where the ׁ of similitude is followed by a noun not made definite and which is also without the article, require a particular, thorough investigation.*

To this I reply, that I did not notice Gesenius’s rule because I consider it as either *superfluous* or *erroneous*. For if Gesenius means, as you seem to suppose, that the article is omitted after the ׁ of similitude when the noun is followed by another which is definite, this needs no mention, since the first noun as a matter of course never receives the article (see § 717. II. b. a. β. γ). Does he however mean, as I think he does from the examples he adduces, that the article after ׁ is omitted whenever the noun is qualified by a following adjective, participle, or noun with a preposition, this does not hold good;* since we also find nouns with ׁ taking the article when followed by a qualificative adjective, e. g. בִּשְׁמֶן יְהוֹב *like the precious ointment*, Ps. 133 : 2; בְּהֵאָנִים יְהוֹבֹת תְּאֵלָה *like these good figs*, Jer. 24 : 5, 8.

* It is true that in the Latin edition of his Lexicon (1833), the assertion is restricted by a “*plerumque*,” *for the most part*; but in the last German edition since published (1834), and which must be taken as giving the author’s latest views, no qualifying expression is made use of.

29 : 17 ; or participle, e. g. *כַּטֵּל מִשְׁקֵרִים* like the early dew, Hos. 6 : 4, 13 : 3, *בַּיָּם נִגְרָשׁ* like the troubled sea, Is. 57 : 20, *בַּמַּיִם* like water spilt, 2 Sam. 14 : 14 : while on the other hand, as you justly observe, comparisons are made with equal or still greater frequency by means of *כ* without the article, before nouns which are *not* followed by any such qualifying term ; thus we have *כַּמוֹץ* like the chaff, Is. 41 : 15, Ps. 1 : 4, and *כַּמוֹץ* like chaff, Hos. 13 : 3 ; *כְּנֶשֶׁר* like the eagle, Jer. 48 : 40, 49 : 16, 22, Ps. 103 : 5, and *כְּנֶשֶׁר* like an eagle, Deut. 32 : 11, Job 9 : 26 ; *כְּנִחָשׁ* like the serpent, Jer. 46 : 22, and *כְּנִחָשׁ* like a serpent, Prov. 23 : 32 ; *כְּלִבְיָא* like the lioness, Isa. 5 : 29, and *כְּלִבְיָא* like a lioness, Num. 23 : 24, Deut. 33 : 20, Hos. 13 : 8, so *כְּאַרְיֵה* like a lion, Gen. 49 : 9, Ps. 7 : 3, 17 : 12 ; *כְּגִבּוֹר* like the mighty man, Is. 42 : 13, and *כְּגִבּוֹר* like a mighty man, Zech. 10 : 7, Job 16 : 4. Here we see both that a noun with *כ* sometimes has the article even followed by an adjective or participle ; and again, frequently has it not, even when destitute of such qualification. But in fact, the use or omission of the article after *כ* entirely depends on whether the writer desires to lay an emphasis on the name of the thing with which the comparison is made or not ; just as one may say in English, “ *the* lion shall eat straw like *the* ox,” or “ *a* lion shall eat straw like *an* ox : ” and in the examples given by Gesenius without the article, the article is omitted not on account of the following word, but simply because the writer views the noun as indefinite, and expresses it accordingly. But when he views the noun as definite and hence lays a stress upon it, he places the article before the noun, and either uses or omits it before the following adjective or participle (see examples given above) ; and if this noun, instead of being followed by a qualificative, be in construction with another following noun, he will of course place the article before this latter only, e. g. *כְּחֹל הַיָּם* like the sand of the sea, Gen. 32 : 12, 41 : 49, Is. 10 : 22, *כִּלְבַּת רֹאשׁ הָאֲרֵיָה* like the head of the lion, 2 Sam. 17 : 10, Ezek. 18 : 4, *כְּעוֹף הַשָּׁמַיִם* like the fowl of the air, Hos. 7 : 12.

Now your query : When is the *כ* of similitude followed by the article, and when not ? I would change into the following : When does the writer usually lay a stress upon the noun with which the comparison is made, and consequently prefix the article to it ; and when does he not ? To this I would reply by giving the following rule, viz. that when the writer makes a comparison with something that is generally known, presenting

the noun that denotes it unrestricted in its qualities before the reader, who is expected to recall to mind all the attributes of the object in order to rightly understand the comparison, he generally lays a stress upon such noun, and accordingly places the article before it: thus, "thou shalt make the hills like *the chaff*," Is. 41: 15; "thy youth shall renew itself like *the eagle*," Ps. 103: 5, etc. etc. But when he qualifies and restricts the meaning of the noun in any way, either by an adjective, participle, verb, or relative pronoun—the noun forming the subject, or by a preposition that indicates its relation to another noun, so that the reader is not left to recall its attributes by an unaided effort of mind, he generally lays no stress upon it, and accordingly leaves it without the article; thus, "like *chaff* that passeth away," Is. 29: 5, Hos. 13: 3; "as *an eagle* stirreth up her nest," Deut. 32: 11, etc. etc. We even meet with examples of both these kinds of construction in one and the same verse, e. g. עֹלֵל יְעֹלְלוּ בְּפֶתֶן שְׂאֲרֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל חֶשֶׁב יָדָהּ כְּבוֹצֵר עַל-סִלְסֹלוֹת *they shall thoroughly glean the remnant of Israel as a vine; turn back thy hand as a grape-gatherer into the baskets*, Is. 6: 9, 23, חֲלוֹא כֹה דְבָרִי בְּאֵשׁ נְאֻם-יְהוָה וּכְפֹטִישׁ יִפְצֹץ סֶלֶעַ *is not my word like the fire? saith the Lord; and like a hammer that breaketh the rock in pieces?* 23: 29. But, be it remembered, these rules will hold good generally, but not always; for a writer sometimes lays no stress upon the noun even when left unrestricted, and *vice versa*.

In the examples next quoted, as הַלֵּוֹיִם *the lion*, הַיְּהוּדִים *the bear*, הַיָּגְדִי *the kid*, the use of the article may also be easily accounted for, and cannot in my opinion be likened to that of הַזֶּלְמָה. In these instances the context shows that the writer means merely one of the class spoken of, without designing to specify any individual in particular, and where accordingly we would use the indefinite article. But, as I have said in my Grammar, the Hebrew writer here uses the definite article emphatically, "to render prominent the *nature and properties* of the class of objects denoted, rather than the *object itself*" (§ 720. II. 2. a.); thus David in giving to Saul a proof of his courage and strength says, וַיָּבֹא הַלֵּוֹיִם וְהַיְּהוּדִים *and there came the lion and the bear*, 1 Sam. 17: 34, meaning, there came one of each of those powerful, ferocious animals, the lion and the bear, and still I slew them; so too the passages, 1 Kings 20: 36, Amos 5: 19, also Judg. 14: 6, *Samson rent the lion as one rends the kid* (כִּנְשֵׁס יָגְדִי), that young and tender animal. This explana-

tion coincides with the principle laid down by Ewald, which is recommended by you to my serious attention and quoted in the following words, "the article is used with nouns that signify a species in order to designate an individual and all possible like individuals of the same species definitely separated or distinguished from other different species;" but with this difference, that in stating that the writer uses the article in such cases "to render prominent the *nature and properties* of the class of objects denoted, rather than the individual objects themselves," I think I have hit nearer the mark, and will also be more easily understood by others.

Having given you my opinion respecting the use of the article in the word הַמֶּלֶךְ Is. 7 : 14, and in the other instances which you have incidentally introduced, I now proceed to your second query, of a contrary nature, i. e. with regard to the omission of the article in the passage עַד מָשִׁיחַ נָגִיד Dan. 9 : 25, where the English version employs the definite article, thus, "from the going forth of the command to return and build Jerusalem unto *the* Messiah *the* Prince," etc. Your question is, "Is it admissible by the laws of Hebrew grammar to translate this passage as it now stands in our version? is it correct to translate unto *the* Messiah, when in Hebrew the article is omitted?" To this I answer, that in my opinion it is correct, and in accordance with the principle I have given above, viz. that the prophet or poet frequently omits the article even where the noun must be regarded as definite (see p. 413): and the example in Dan. 9 : 25, I take to be one of this kind; since, if we examine the entire passage, we find that the prophet in his vivid description of the vision he has seen likewise omits the article before other nouns where the prose writer would be required to use it, as they are undoubtedly definite; thus in the expression מִצֵּאת דְּבַר לְהָשִׁיב *the going forth of the command*, etc., the word דְּבַר *command* is specific, and in prose would take the article; again in verse 26, מָשִׁיחַ ought to have the article because mentioned before in v. 25, yet it is omitted. Hence we are justified in asserting that עַד מָשִׁיחַ is not left anarthrous because the prophet wishes to make his statement indefinite, but because its definiteness is so clear and obvious before his excited mind, that he considers it unnecessary to point it out by means of the article. The assertion of Hengstenberg, that מָשִׁיחַ is here used as a proper noun, is incorrect,

as you rightly observe ; since in that case the following נָגִיד would necessarily take the article.

Your last question, " Are there any fixed principles with regard to such omission of the article by the poets ? " is difficult to answer, as it principally depends on the subjective state of the poet's mind ; but it may be generally remarked that he omits the article with a definite noun only where the context or the nature of the noun would prevent any ambiguity from this cause, as in מֶלֶךְ *the king*, Ps. 21 : 2, Esth. 1 : 19 ; מָשִׁיחַ *the Messiah*, Dan. 9 : 25, where only one individual can be alluded to ; as also in the case of monadic objects, e. g. שֶׁשׁ *the sun*, אֶרֶץ *the earth*, Ps. 2 : 2, Job 9 : 24. The article is also not unfrequently omitted by a poet before a noun in one clause of a sentence when it is prefixed to a corresponding noun in another and parallel clause, as in Is. 11 : 5, 13 : 10, 13, Ezek. 7 : 27. (See Gram. § 718.)

I have thus endeavored to answer your grammatical inquiries according to my opinions ; but I am not sure that this will remove your difficulties. I have done so with pleasure, and shall always be ready, if health will permit, to discuss any grammatical topic, even of a graver nature than the above, which you may in future find time or inclination to suggest. In the meantime I am, dear sir,

Yours with great respect and esteem,

I. NORDHEIMER.

ARTICLE VIII.

REVIEW OF ROBINSON'S BIBLICAL RESEARCHES.

By Rev. Charles Hall, New-York, one of the Secretaries of the American Home Missionary Society.

Biblical Researches in Palestine, Mount Sinai and Arabia Petræa. A Journal of Travels in the year 1838, by E. Robinson and E. Smith, undertaken in reference to Biblical Geography. Drawn up from the Original Diaries, with Historical Illustrations, by Edward Robinson, D. D., Professor of Biblical Literature in the Union Theological Seminary, New-York, Author of a Greek and English Lexicon of the New Testament, etc. With new Maps and Plans, in Five Sheets. In Three Volumes, 8vo. Boston: Crocker & Brewster. New-York: Jonathan Leavitt. London: John Murray. Halle: Waisenhausbuchhandlung. pp. 599, 679, 721.

PALESTINE is the subject of associations more sacred and interesting than any other section of the globe. Whenever our thoughts recur to the origin and spread of the human race, or to the great leading facts connected with that revelation on which our religion is founded, the imagination flies at once to that hoary land, which God selected as the dwelling place of his chosen people. The classic countries of Greece and Italy awaken in our minds an enduring interest by the scientific renown of their sons, and by the splendor of their arts, which still glows amid the ruins of their former greatness. And yet, compared with Palestine, what have Greece and Italy done for the great interests of man? Their influence on the character and destiny of succeeding ages might all have been spared, and yet the nations have been fired with the love of liberty by the orators of other lands, or polished by the arts and letters of another race. "The present condition of the world," it has been justly said, "might not have been materially different from what it is, had Alexander never been born, and had Julius Cæsar died in his cradle." But the influence of Palestine on the welfare of the human family is indispensable. Her seers, prophets and people were set, first, to promulgate the principles

of God's government of men, and then, to illustrate its operation in their own history. The land where they dwelt is, therefore, intimately related to the past condition of our world, and also extends its influence through the present, down to all future ages, and has no other limits, either in space or time, than the limits of human existence. From that small territory agencies have gone forth, excelling in their results those of all other lands. It is no wonder, then, that, by the common consent of all Christendom, it is held to be sacred. What recollections come crowding upon the mind, as we review its history! In that country, and those immediately adjacent, are comprised the localities of most of the stupendous events which attended the creation, the fall and the redemption of the race. It was on those venerable mountains and in those sequestered vallies, that Jehovah came down to talk with men. There miracles were wrought; there prophecy was uttered and fulfilled. There are Sinai and Horeb, speaking of God's majesty and holy law; and there were Shiloh and Zion, with the altar and the mercy seat. There Abraham fed his flocks, David led forth his victorious armies, and Jesus magnified the law and made it honorable. Almost at a single glance, the eye of the pilgrim may take in Bethlehem whence the Saviour was born, Calvary where he died, and Olivet whence he ascended up on high. Over those wavy hills and quiet vales of Galilee, Samaria and Judea, he went, in many a weary journey, down to the hour when he declared the completion of the stupendous work which the Father gave him to do, by exclaiming: "It is finished."

But it is not only because of these associations, that Palestine attracts to itself so much of our regard; it is found that the more we become acquainted with the geography, the natural history, the existing population and customs of that land, the better we understand the meaning, and enjoy the beauties of the Holy Scriptures. While the people and manners of the western nations are liable to change, with every new form of social organization or political revolution, the Orientals remain, in many respects, as they were three thousand years ago. Although the Macedonian destroyer swept over the plains of Asia, and after him came the eagle of Rome, yet both Macedon and Rome are as if they had not been. They have been blotted out from among the nations, while the people of Palestine and Arabia, whom they conquered, survive their destroyers; and their genius, the idioms of their languages, and their social customs seem

endowed with a kind of immortality, where every thing else is tending to alteration and decay.

The report of these customs has shed light on many passages of the Holy Scriptures which would be otherwise unintelligible. Since the principle of historical interpretation has gained the ascendancy, commentators manifest an increasing readiness to avail themselves of this class of facts. Illustrations drawn from the geography, natural history and customs of countries mentioned in the Bible are not only admirably adapted to interest the minds of the common people, but also rank high among the legitimate means of interpretation, and even among the evidences that the sacred books are indeed the productions of the writers and the periods to which they profess to belong.

Is it not surprising, therefore, that for some years past, the public has shown a disposition to patronize all works which profess to afford the means of explaining the Scriptures by oriental allusions? The journal of the traveller, the portfolio of the artist and the cabinet of the antiquary have been explored for materials which might be available for this purpose. These have been furnished to the public, with every variety of letter-press and of pictorial embellishment, from the paragraph of a newspaper to the elaborate dictionary, and from the coarsest wood-cuts to the finest engravings; and in all these forms have met with a liberal patronage.

In view of this favorable appreciation of works professing to illustrate the word of God, it is a matter of regret that our authentic materials for this purpose are yet so scanty. We would not undervalue the learned labors of such writers as Calmet and his editors; but would rather express our obligations to them for showing, by what they have done, the value of this species of research, and the probable importance of the similar results which are yet to be developed. After all that has been accomplished, it is still true, that our knowledge of Palestine has been supplied mainly by ignorant monks or credulous pilgrims, or by travellers who either had little sympathy with revelation, or who visited the Holy Land under disadvantages that forbade the acquisition of such information as the biblical interpreter requires. Almost all that has been believed on such authority has needed to be verified by fresh investigation. It is not enough that a reported fact *seems* to be just what it *should* be to explain some text of the Bible; both the fact itself and the original of the text need to be considered on the spot to which

they refer, by one who unites in himself the eye to observe and the learning and judgment to apply what he observes. As an illustration of the doubtful character of the facts which have been adduced to explain scriptural allusions, take the following: A popular lecturer on Palestine, not long since, told his audiences in all parts of the United States, that the passage in Jer. 49: 19* is finely illustrated by the annual overflow of the Jordan, which compels the lion and other animals to escape to the higher lands adjoining. And to make the fact more impressive and give it a scientific air, it was said that this occurs at the very time of the year mentioned in Josh. 3: 15, and is caused by the melting of the snows on Mount Hermon. But unfortunately for this beautiful exposition, it turns out, on the testimony of respectable witnesses, that neither the phenomenon nor the cause assigned for it takes place as asserted. Of course the true exposition of the passages referred to must be sought in some criticism on the original, or some other topographical fact to be developed by future research, or, perhaps, by both of these processes carried on together by some competent individual. The proper application of a large share of the names of plants and animals mentioned in the Scriptures is yet to be determined by an accurate study of the natural history of the East; e. g. the original word for *chamois*, Deut. 14: 5; *bittern*, Isa. 14: 23; *rose*, Cant. 2: 1; *mulberry*, 2 Sam. 5: 23, 24; *mustard*, Matt. 13: 31, 32, etc. Of all the places mentioned in Scripture, how few have been identified with modern sites, and, consequently, how much remains to be accomplished by the learning and zeal of the future traveller. It would be easy to fill a volume with an enumeration of particulars requiring the union, in the same person, of profound scholarship with a personal observation of the physical and social condition of the eastern shores of the Mediterranean; and each of these particulars, if successfully investigated, would impart new significancy to some passage of the word of truth.

The reasons why this field of profitable inquiry has remained so long unexplored in the manner it deserves are easily given. Previous to the Reformation, the habit of receiving the exposition of the Scriptures on the authority of the church repressed

* "He shall come up like a lion from the swellings of Jordan upon the habitation of the strong."

the spirit of original investigation. Intimately associated with this authority were the legends of saints, the tales of pilgrims and the traditions of monasteries in the Holy Land; so that scholars had scarcely the courage or the disposition to doubt what came to them through such pious channels. After the emancipation of the western church from this intellectual thralldom, there were two chief causes for neglecting the exposition of the Bible by the modern condition of Palestine. First, were the personal danger to be encountered, and the obstacles thrown in the way of investigation by the haughty jealousy of the Mohammedan masters of the country. Again, the friends of the truth were engrossed with its defence against Popery, but more especially with the work of ascertaining the sacred text itself. It was an era of the collation of manuscripts, various readings of polyglotts and verbal criticism. In the providence of God, the intellect of the Protestant world was then waked up to intense interest and indefatigable labor in this department of sacred learning, so that succeeding generations of biblical students are relieved from most of the literary toil of their predecessors, and may give themselves unreservedly to the work of interpretation.

That more exact and extended accounts of Palestine and the surrounding regions are greatly to be desired, for the exposition of the Scriptures, will be evident from a brief survey of the materials which have hitherto been made available for this purpose.

The first class of writers on the Holy Land, to whom we are indebted for illustrations of the sacred writings, are those who flourished prior to A. D. 400. Among these Josephus is the most important, on account of the number and variety of his facts and allusions. There are also the Onomasticon of Eusebius and Jerome, a brief gazeteer of places mentioned in the Bible, together with other writings of the latter; the geographical writings of Ptolemy; the Peutinger Table, a map of the military roads of the empire, referred to the time of Theodosius the Great; the Talmud, and also the Jerusalem and other itineraries. These, if not all, are certainly the most important materials furnished by that period to which we naturally look for the most authentic notices of Palestine and the most recent and uncorrupted traditions. And these sources of information are indeed invaluable, so far as they go, for the hints which they furnish to guide the modern inquirer and to test his results. How

much may be accomplished by the mere collation of the scattered fragments of information in ancient authors, is seen in the great work of HADRIAN RELAND. This learned writer,—until lately, “*facile princeps*” among those who have gleaned in that field,—has so nearly exhausted the earlier sources of information, as to possess himself almost the authority of an original witness. And yet the materials so diligently compiled are insufficient except for the most general purposes. They enabled the geographer to construct maps of the Holy Land with tolerable accuracy of outline, and to designate the more important sites. But still there were many inaccuracies, not to say great incompleteness in all these charts. To show by a few examples the deficiency of data afforded by the early writers, we may refer to a map constructed from them by Nicholas Sanson, geographer to the king of France, about A. D. 1660. On this map, among other curious matters, we find Mount Seir stretching in a southeasterly direction from the vicinity of Gaza to a point south of the Dead Sea; while along its base flows the Torrent of Egypt from Petra to the Mediterranean. The river Kishon, also, is made to connect, like a canal, the waters of Gennessaret with the Bay of Acre;—a facility for internal navigation, which we have seen copied into maps constructed even within the present century. So, likewise, the chart prepared by Lightfoot, from the Talmudists, Josephus, Pliny, etc. (about A. D. 1650), is wholly inaccurate. The following are some of its features: the mountain ranges of Libanus and Anti-Libanus are laid down as running east and west, instead of north and south. The river which waters the plain of Damascus is made to run westwardly, contrary to the fact. The Kishon is placed at the southern instead of the northern base of Mount Carmel. The Jordan runs nearly west from the Sea of Tiberias to the Dead Sea. The Red Sea, instead of being separated into two bays by the peninsula of Sinai, is represented as a single gulf, extending nearly east and west, while Mount Sinai lies northeasterly from Suez, and northwesterly from Ezion Geber. A circumstance which greatly impairs the utility of the ancient geographical notices is this: they are accustomed to say, for example, that one place is north from another, when it lies in any northerly direction, whether northeast or northwest, or still nearer to the eastern or western points. For reasons such as these it is manifest that, in reference to geography alone, the early wri-

ters are extremely defective. And this deficiency is equally striking in other particulars.

A *second* class that has furnished materials of the kind we are considering is composed of writers who flourished between A. D. 400 and 1400. The authors belonging to this period were either ecclesiastics residing in Palestine, or pilgrims and crusaders from abroad—with the exception of the Arabian geographers, El-Edrisi, (A. D. 1150,) and Abulfæda, (A. D. 1300,) Bohaeddin, the companion of Saladin (A. D. 1200,) and Benjamin of Tudela, a Spanish Jew, (A. D. 1170.) Of the Christian authorities, the most important are the French Bishop Arculfus, as drawn up by Adamnanus, near the close of the seventh century, and William, Archbishop of Tyre, a historian of the Crusades, at the end of the twelfth. The tract of Brocardus, A. D. 1283, the amusing “*voiage and travaile*” of Sir John Maundeville, A. D. 1322—56, and the journal of Ludolph de Suchem, about the same time, should also be added. At the beginning of this millennium of darkness and superstition, when religion was gradually becoming less spiritual, and passing more and more every year into a mere excitement of the imagination by means of relics and traditions, there was a constant motive for the priests and monks to multiply the sources of this excitement. Hence they traced out the site of every scriptural event, and legendary occurrence that could be in any way connected with the Scriptures. The inventions of succeeding generations of ecclesiastics did not suffer these sites to diminish in number or sanctity; so that tradition, once fixed, remained unchanged in its essential features during the whole period under review. This traditional information is not unfrequently absurd in itself, as well as directly at variance with the Scriptures.* Moreover the monks were generally foreigners, knowing little of the topography of the land, and less still of the vernacular language of the people,—an acquisition by no means necessary for the purposes of their mission.† Of course,

* For example, the monks show in Jerusalem the houses of Dives and Lazarus as historical verities. They also designate the top of Olivet as the place of Christ's ascension, while the Evangelist tells us expressly, that he ascended from Bethany. Luke 24: 50, 51.

† This is as true in modern as it was in ancient times. Rev. Pliny Fisk met with a Catholic priest at Cana, near Nazareth,

they were incapacitated as well as indisposed for original investigation, and blindly received for themselves and imparted to others traditional tales instead of authentic facts. When, at length, the crusaders arrived, it was to conquer and not to investigate. The reports, then, which crusaders and pilgrims have left us concerning Palestine, are to be regarded as furnishing only casual illustrations of its geography and condition, while the mass of their itineraries are still the same repeated stories of credulous superstition or the inventions of pious fraud.

The period since A. D. 1400 has been prolific in works on Palestine, although by far the greater number add little on which the interpreter can rely. The following deserve most notice. Mejr-ed-Din, an Arabian writer in A. D. 1495, described the Holy City. Breydenbach and Fabri visited Jerusalem and Mount Sinai in 1484. The botany of Palestine was partially investigated by Rauwolf in 1573. In 1586, a Fleming named Zualert produced his "Devout Pilgrimage to Jerusalem." His engravings, though by no means accurate, seem to have served as copies for many of the pictorial illustrations of later journalists. A better class of writers are the following—Cotovicus, (1598,) Sandys, (1610,) an original observer and faithful narrator, Monconys, (1646,) who collected valuable facts concerning the arts and sciences in Egypt and Syria. Doubdan, a Frenchman, in 1652, exhibits considerable learning, and his researches have probably supplied less accurate and painstaking authors with many interesting facts and speculations. D'Arvieux resided in Sidon from 1658 to 1665, and gave an account of the Arab tribes. But no travellers have been more used by expositors of the Bible, than Henry Maundrell and Dr. Shaw. The former was chaplain to the English factory at Aleppo, and made a hasty visit to Jerusalem in 1697. His observations on portions of the north of Palestine have not, even to this day, been superseded by any more accurate work. Shaw's travels date a quarter of a century later, and his notices are judicious and valuable. The natural history of Palestine received its most important contributions from the letters of Hasselquist, the Swede, to Linnæus, about 1750. Niebuhr (1767,) is another of the scientific travellers of the first class; but it is to be re-

who had been thirty years in Palestine without ever learning the language of the country.

gretted that his visit to Jerusalem was hurried, and he learned little more than was told him by the monks.

In the present century, the earliest traveller is Dr. E. D. Clarke, who, though long regarded as the best of authority, is now found to have been rash in his theories and deficient in judgment. Those who have been induced by his learning to confide in his hypotheses have been obliged, on better information, to reject much of what he had taught them. In proof of this we have but to refer to his assertion, that the castle of Santorri (Sânnûr) is the ancient Samaria; again, that the Jordan maintains its current through the whole length of the sea of Galilee; and that Mount Zion lay south of the valley of Hinnom! From 1803 to 1810, Seetzen, a judicious and enterprising traveller journeyed extensively in the East, and great value is attached to his researches. But unhappily, the greater part of his manuscripts have never been published; and those which have been given to the world are scattered through many volumes of a German periodical, and therefore not generally accessible. An indefatigable laborer in the cause of science, John Lewis Burckhardt, resided in the East from 1809 to 1816. Although his observations on the Holy Land were only incidental,—his main object being to explore the interior of Africa,—yet they are of great value in reference to the topography of Palestine and the customs of the Arab tribes. Burckhardt is one of the very few travellers in that country who had intercourse with the people, and spoke their language. Still the disadvantages attending his observations were very great; and he was often compelled in the most interesting localities to make his notes by stealth, or to forego them entirely, on account of the jealousy of his Bedawin companions.

Besides the writers above enumerated there have been many others of a more popular character, which, however interesting on account of personal incidents, are of little value to the interpreter of Scripture. Such are the eloquent but superficial itinerary of Chateaubriand; the travels of Buckingham,—too well understood to need to be characterized; the travels of Dr. Richardson,—pleasing but not always to be trusted; the poetical fancies of Lamartine,—to write which it was not needful that he should ever have left Paris; and the work of Laborde, valuable rather for its splendid plates than for the accuracy of its topographical information. To the same general class belong the “Incidents of Travel” of our countryman, Mr. Ste-

phens,—a pair of volumes unsurpassed in the interest of personal adventure, but adding little to our previous stock of topographical information, because the writer had never made Palestine his study, and therefore, except in tact and enterprise, was quite unfurnished for the work of exploration.

We have been thus minute in our glance at the materials for fact, biblical illustration, in order to impress upon the reader the that *the great work of collecting exact information on this subject is but just begun*. Of the writers to whom we have referred, how many give us only the silly fables of the convents. How large a proportion of travellers have visited Palestine under circumstances that forbade their prosecuting any extended inquiry. Maundrell's visit was very brief. Buckingham was in Palestine only about three months; Dr. Clarke but seventeen days; and Niebuhr not much longer. Volney was a proclaimed infidel; nor did Burckhardt manifest any special sympathy with Christianity. Some visitors were learned but skeptical; others were pious but unlearned; others still were greatly wanting in a tact for observation. Thus Jowett, though deeply interested in the sacred uses to which his notices might be turned, makes the Kedron flow westward from Jerusalem—exactly contrary to the fact. Most travellers have been unable to hold intercourse with the people of Palestine, except through interpreters incapable of appreciating the subjects of communication. Even Pococke knew little Arabic, and the recent travellers have been, almost without exception, cut off by this circumstance from all communication with the natives. Thus they were compelled to see every thing through the eyes of the monks, and to take the legends of the convents instead of personal investigation. How little just information of the interior of the oriental bosom with its peculiar associations; how little even of topographical details could they acquire in these circumstances. Let us suppose some foreigner,—a Bedawi Arab, for instance,—to spend six or eight weeks in travelling post-haste through New England; suppose him obliged to communicate with the people only through an interpreter, and that interpreter some African slave who had learned Arabic in his youth on the great Sahara, and English amid the cotton fields of Georgia. How much information could the most intelligent visitor, amid such circumstances, carry away with him, to be used in illustrating the literature, the physical, social and moral condition of the Yankees and their country? Scarcely less preposterous

is it to expect that Frank travellers in the East can master the facts essential for biblical illustration, by a mere "summer ramble," or "three weeks in Palestine," with no better medium for the interchange of thought with the people, than the miserable *patois* of a Maltese rover, in the capacity of *dragoman*.

These considerations prepare us to appreciate in some degree the invaluable volumes of Dr. Robinson. This great work enjoys the enviable distinction of being free from the objections to other writings alluded to above. The literary preparation which preceded the author's journey, his peculiar advantages for prosecuting it, the free intercourse he enjoyed with the native population, his laborious personal examinations of the country, and lastly the abundant historical illustrations with which the work abounds, combine to render these volumes a treasury of information, and fully justify the enthusiastic language of Professor Ritter of Berlin: "Now first begins, since the days of Reland, the second great epoch of our knowledge of the promised land!"

Dr. Robinson has long been known, both in this country and in Europe, as a profound and accurate linguist, and as one who has labored with great zeal to elevate the standard of biblical learning. His own contributions to this department are too well known to need to be enumerated here. In the course of his professional duties, he became fully apprized of the deficiency in the materials of biblical illustration; and many years since projected a personal exploration of the regions on which his studies had been so much employed. He was hindered, however, from fulfilling his intention, until, by a series of providential arrangements, obstacles were removed and facilities prepared, that mark the time and circumstances of his visit as apparently more advantageous than any that preceded it, or that may be expected soon to occur again. In 1832, the Rev. Eli Smith, of the American Mission at Beirût, a former pupil of Dr. R., made a visit to the United States. He had just returned from an extensive tour with Rev. H. G. O. Dwight through Armenia and Persia; and the personal friendship and literary sympathy between him and Dr. R. led to an agreement that they would attempt a journey together, by way of Mount Sinai and Akabah to Petra, and thence by Hebron to Jerusalem. Mr. Smith's qualifications for a profitable travelling companion on such an expedition are not surpassed by those of any other individual. Says Dr. R.:

"I count myself fortunate in being thus early assured of the company of one, who, by his familiar and accurate knowledge of the Arabic language, by his acquaintance with the people of Syria, and by the experience gained in former extensive journeys, was so well qualified to alleviate the difficulties and overcome the obstacles which usually accompany oriental travel. Indeed, to these qualifications of my companion, combined with his taste for geographical and historical researches, and his tact in eliciting and sifting the information to be obtained from an Arab population, are mainly to be ascribed the more important and interesting results of our journey."

Dr. R. left New-York in July, 1837, and passing through England, proceeded to Germany, where he conferred with Gesenius, Tholuck and Roediger on topics of importance connected with the researches on which he was about to enter. On the 1st Dec. he embarked at Trieste, and in about a week arrived at Athens. After seventeen days spent amid monuments reared to commemorate human greatness, but now serving only to mark its downfall, he left these scenes of sad but thrilling associations, and arrived by steamer at Alexandria, on the last day of 1837. Thence he proceeded up the Nile to Cairo, the Pyramids and Thebes. Returning to Cairo, he was joined by Mr. Smith, agreeably to their previous arrangement. We pass over the brief account of Egypt and its modern Pharaoh, Mohammed Ali, and the valuable observations concerning the probable bearing of his policy on the progress of human improvement in the East, and confine our notices to the themes of principal interest, the journey through the "great and terrible wilderness" and Palestine.

Previous to setting out from Cairo, they had to make preparations for a month's travel in the desert, and that our readers may appreciate the nature of their accommodations, we extract the account of their outfit.

"A tent was to be purchased and fitted up; water-skins were to be procured and kept full of water, which was to be changed every day in order to extract the strong taste of the leather; provisions were to be laid in for a whole month, as we could hope to obtain little either at Suez or at the Convent; besides all the numerous smaller articles which are essential to the traveller's progress and health, even if he renounce all

expectation of convenience and comfort. In all these purchases we were greatly indebted to the faithful services of our Janizary Mustafa, whom we remember with gratitude.

"We chose a large tent with a single pole. This was folded into two rolls, for which we had sacks; so that it was easily packed and loaded, and suffered little damage on the way. We had large pieces of painted canvass to spread upon the ground under our beds; and found these more convenient than poles or bedsteads; as the mattresses could be rolled up in them during the day, and thus be protected from dust or rain.

"Our provisions consisted chiefly of rice and biscuit. The latter is bulky; and at a later period we substituted for it flour, from which our servants made unleavened bread; this was baked in thin cakes upon an iron plate, and proved quite palatable and not unwholesome. Flesh may be obtained occasionally from the Arabs upon the way. With coffee, tea, sugar, butter, dried apricots, tobacco, wax-candles, etc., we were well supplied. We found the dried apricots quite a luxury in the desert; and a timely distribution of coffee and tobacco among the Arabs is an easy mode of winning their favor and confidence. We had wooden boxes, like those of the Mecca pilgrims, for packing many of the articles; but afterwards abandoned them for small sacks and larger saddle-bags of hair-cloth, like those of the Bedawin. These proved to be more advantageous as diminishing the bulk of the loads, and thus removing a source of expense and a cause of grumbling among the camel-drivers and muleteers. We took also a supply of charcoal, which proved of essential service."

With these equipments, two guns and a brace of pistols,—not for use, but as a terror to evil doers,—instruments for taking measurements, bearings, etc., two Arab servants and Beshârah,—the same who accompanied Laborde, for a guide, and a *ménage* of three dromedaries and five camels, with six or eight Arabs to drive them, the travellers set out from Cairo on the 12th of March, 1838. They soon passed from the associations of civilized life to the novel and exciting feeling of finding themselves alone in the midst of the desert, "in the true style of oriental travel, carrying with them their house, their provisions and a supply of water for many days," surrounded by their uncouth animals and the no less uncouth sons of the desert, in a region where the weary eye in vain sought relief from the omnipresent desolation. Yet even the desert had its subjects of interest. Spe-

cimens of petrified wood were at first abundant ; and among the pebbles with which the ground was strewed, jaspers and chalcidones were common. A less pleasing sight was the frequent carcases and skeletons of camels, which had broken down and died by the way. The party arrived at Suez on the 15th of March, and spent a day in examining the vicinity, with reference to the difficulties which have been raised concerning the Mosaic account of the journey of the Israelites from Rameses to the Red Sea in the space of three days, and the passage of such an immense multitude through the sea itself in part of a single night. For the results at which our travellers arrived and the reasons by which they are supported we refer to the volumes,* adding merely, that in our opinion all ground of difficulty seems to be satisfactorily removed.

Leaving Suez on the 16th of March, they proceeded to the region of Sinai, and arrived at the Convent on the 23d. Their route, though in many respects toilsome and dreary, was crowded with associations of the deepest interest. They sat under the palm-trees at the fountains of Moses ; their camels drank freely of the bitter waters of Marah, and they pitched their solitary tent at Elim, where, in other ages, the desert was covered for many a furlong, with the encampments and herds of the Hebrew emigrants.

In one of the mountain gorges through which their path lay, the party came upon some of those rude drawings and inscriptions on the rocks, which are of such frequent occurrence in the peninsula of Sinai, and which have been by various authors attributed to the children of Israel on their way to Horeb. From the time when these rock writings were first mentioned by Cosmas, A. D. 535, to the present day, their purport has remained a mystery. It is a very singular fact, and one which strikingly illustrates the changeful nature of human affairs, that here, in these lone mountains, an alphabet is found graven on the face of the cliffs, which is shown by the thousands of inscriptions to have been in common use, but of which no other traces remain in all the voluminous literature of the world ! But at length the power of science has compelled these silent solitudes to speak, and reveal their long kept mysteries. In 1839, Professor Beer,

* See also Dr. Robinson's article on "the Land of Goshen and the Exodus of the Israelites." *Am. Bib. Repos.*, Vol. III. No. VI. April, 1840.

of Leipzig—since numbered among the many martyrs of learning—deciphered these inscriptions. But,—alas for the enthusiasm of antiquarians!—he has, with the removal of the mystery, dispersed also much of the interest. The inscriptions consist chiefly of proper names, and probably belong to an age when the region of Sinai was the pious resort of numerous Christian pilgrims.

On the route between Suez and Sinai, Dr. R. and his party turned aside to visit a cluster of ancient remains, whose history modern investigation has in vain endeavored to elucidate. Away, amid those sandy wastes, in a range of mountains six or seven hundred feet high, are found the inexplicable structures, called by the Bedawin, *Sūrâbît el-Khâdim*.

“ These lie mostly within the compass of a small enclosure, one hundred and sixty feet long from E. to W. by seventy feet broad, marked by heaps of stones thrown or fallen together, the remains perhaps of former walls or rows of low buildings. Within this space are seen about fifteen upright stones, like tombstones, and several fallen ones, covered with Egyptian hieroglyphics; and also the remains of a small temple, whose columns are decorated with the head of Isis for a capital. At the eastern end is a subterranean chamber excavated in the solid rock, resembling an Egyptian sepulchre. It is square; and the roof is supported in the middle by a square column left from the rock. Both the column and the sides of the chamber are covered with hieroglyphics; and in each of the sides is a small niche. The whole surface of the enclosure is covered with fallen columns, fragments of sculpture and hewn stones strewn in every direction; over which the pilgrim can with difficulty find his way. Other similar upright stones stand without the enclosure in various directions, and even at some distance; each surrounded by a heap of stones, which may have been thrown together by the Arabs. These upright stones, both within and without the enclosure, vary from about seven to ten feet in height; while they are from eighteen inches to two feet in breadth, and from fourteen to sixteen inches in thickness. They are rounded off on the top, forming an arch over the broadest sides. On one of these sides usually appears the common Egyptian symbol of the winged globe with two serpents, and one or more priests presenting offerings to the gods; while various figures and cartouches cover the remaining sides. They are said to bear the names of different Egyptian kings; but no two of them have the name of

the same monarch. According to Major Felix, the name of Osirtisen I. is found on one of them, whom Wilkinson supposes to have been the patron of Joseph. Not the least singularity about these monuments is the wonderful preservation of the inscriptions upon this soft sandstone, exposed as they have been to the air and weather during the lapse of so many ages. On some of the stones they are quite perfect; on others both the inscription and the stone itself have been worn away deeply by the tooth of time." Vol. I. p. 113.

What could have been the intent of these temples and monumental structures, in the midst of this voiceless solitude? They are not tombs; there is nothing in them resembling the sepulchral monuments of Egypt. Lord Prudhoe has suggested,—and we give his hypothesis only from the want of a better,—that this may have been a place of pilgrimage for the ancient Egyptians, just as a mountain near Mecca is to the Mohammedans at the present day; and that to it the Egyptian kings made each his visit, and erected a column with his name. The very mystery of this lonely spot makes it deeply interesting, by "leading back the beholder into the gray mists of high antiquity, and filling him with wonder and awe, as he surveys here, far from the abodes of life, the labors of men unknown, for an object alike unknown."

But the most interesting result of this journey through the Sinaitic region is the probable identification of the spot where the law was given to the ancient people of God. It is well known that tradition early selected Jebel Mûsa (Mount of Moses) as the place where this august transaction occurred, and for fifteen centuries chapels, crosses and legendary tales have hallowed it in the estimation of those who were too credulous or too ignorant to doubt. On examining this spot, Robinson and Smith found it to possess none of the features most essential to meet the conditions of the sacred narrative. It is comparatively an interior summit, difficult of access even for a small party, and cut off from an extensive prospect by other mountains, and commanding no neighboring plain or other ground, where a multitude could be assembled. Abandoning, therefore, the guidance of tradition for that of the Bible, our travellers arrived at a conclusion satisfactory to themselves, and, we doubt not, to every unprejudiced reader, that the true Sinai is the mountain now called by the monks Horeb,

lying north from Jebel Mûsa, and overlooking the great plain er-Râhah. Their first view of this plain was when they were on their way to the convent, approaching from the N. W. As they followed the rocky ravine which led into it, the bottom opened gradually, though still shut in on either side by lofty granite ridges with ragged, shattered peaks, a thousand feet high. A fine, broad plain before them sloped gently towards the S. S. E., enclosed by venerable mountains of dark granite,—stern, naked, splintered and indescribably grand,—and terminated at the distance of more than a mile, by the broad and awful front of Horeb, rising perpendicularly, in frowning majesty, from twelve to fifteen hundred feet. “It was,” says Dr. R. “a scene of solemn grandeur wholly unexpected, and such as I had never seen, and the associations which rushed upon our minds were almost overwhelming.”

Obeying the conviction almost forced upon them by this accidental view of the plain er-Râhah, and finding no other area in all the region capable of holding such a multitude as the assembled tribes of Israel, the travellers subsequently explored the adjacent mountain, which they regard as the true Sinai. The almost inaccessible peak which appeared to impend over the plain is called by the Arabs es-Sûfsâfeh.

“This cliff rises some five hundred feet above the basin ; and the distance to the summit is more than half a mile. We first attempted to climb the side in a direct course ; but found the rock so smooth and precipitous, that after some falls and more exposures, we were obliged to give it up, and clamber upwards along a steep ravine by a more northern and circuitous course. From the head of this ravine, we were able to climb around the face of the northern precipice and reach the top, along the deep hollows worn in the granite by the weather during the lapse of ages, which give to this part, as seen from below, the appearance of architectural ornament.

“The extreme difficulty and even danger of the ascent was well rewarded by the prospect that now opened before us. The whole plain er-Râhah lay spread out beneath our feet, with the adjacent Wady's and mountains ; while Wady esh-Sheikh on the right, and the recess on the left, both connected with and opening broadly from er-Râhah, presented an area which serves nearly to double that of the plain. Our conviction was strengthened, that here or on some one of the adjacent cliffs was the spot, where the Lord ‘descended in fire’

and proclaimed the law. Here lay the plain where the whole congregation might be assembled; here was the mount that could be approached and touched, if not forbidden; and here the mountain brow, where alone the lightnings and the thick cloud would be visible, and the thunders and the voice of the trump be heard, when the Lord 'came down in the sight of all the people upon Mount Sinai.' We gave ourselves up to the impressions of the awful scene; and read with a feeling that will never be forgotten, the sublime account of the transaction, and the commandments there promulgated, in the original words as recorded by the great Hebrew legislator." Vol. I. pp. 157, 158.

We know of no theory of any intelligent traveller concerning Sinai, which may compete with this in probability. Burckhardt did indeed suggest that Mount Serbal, a peak west from Horeb, is the spot where the law was given, but the Arabs are unanimous in their testimony, that there are no large vallies in the neighborhood where a great multitude could be congregated.

The description given of this wonderful region makes us feel that it was constructed expressly as the grand and peculiar temple where Jehovah would come near to man in the terrors of his majesty as he never had done, nor ever would again while the earth remaineth. He had but one law to give, and he made but one Sinai. Thither he brought his people, far away from the flesh-pots of Egypt and every other human trust, into deserts where they could not get even bread or water except they came directly from heaven; where many a league of shrubless sands and craggy steeps cut them off from the world. And then, when the solemn time arrived, he led them into the inner sanctuary, the secret, holy place, in the upper, central region of Sinai, having but a single feasible entrance. There, upon the mountains whose summits pierce the sky, and whose riven sides are black with the rust of ages, he bowed the heavens and came down, and uttered in the language of mortals the eternal principles of his government.

Although the great desert of Arabia has often been crossed by travellers, and the notices of the routes of Seetzen, Burckhardt and Laborde are of great value, yet no attempt has been previously made to combine these into a general view by any person who had himself been over the ground, and could connect the isolated facts of others by means of his personal exami-

nations. This important service Robinson and Smith have performed. From the extended details furnished by them we give the following brief view of the country lying between the Red Sea on the south and Palestine on the north.

The great Arabian Peninsula is divided into two portions by a range of mountains more than four thousand feet high. This range originates east of Suez and runs S. S. easterly, parallel to the coast, to about the latitude of N. $29^{\circ} 20'$, where it turns more to the east and crosses the peninsula to the gulf of Akabah. This latter portion is called Jebel et-Tih. Midway between the two gulfs, it gives off two extensive spurs, the first, called also Jebel et-Tih, running N. E., and the other, called Jebel el-Ojmeh, N. N. E. The Desert of Shur and the Wilderness of Sin, through which the Israelites journeyed towards Sinai, lie between the western part of this chain and the gulf of Suez. On the south of et-Tih, the country sinks down about a thousand feet into an uneven sandy plain, several miles in width, to rise again farther south, first, in broken hills of sandstone, then a belt of greenstone and porphyry, and beyond and above all, a region of granite constituting the proper mountains of Sinai. This last is a vast circular assemblage of summits, cleft and surrounded by a labyrinth of passes. Of these the Wady esh-Sheikh is the principal, and the plain, er-Rahah, above mentioned, is simply an expansion of it. The most elevated point in this vicinity is Mount St. Catharine, by barometrical measurement 8068 feet above the sea. Dr. R. concludes that in the Scriptures the name Horeb is applied to this whole cluster, and that Sinai is the name of the particular summit from which the law was given,—exactly contrary to the present application of these names by most commentators.

North of Jebel et-Tih, the whole desert descends towards Palestine. This vast and desolate region has these general features. It is bounded on the east by a deep depression called Wady el-Arabah, from five to twelve miles wide, extending from the gulf of Akabah to the Dead Sea. The region west of this great valley, and north of the range et-Tih, consists of two long basins, between which rises the spur, Jebel el-Ojmeh. The basin on the west is much the larger, and is drained by the water courses which unite in the great Wady el-Arish, running north to the Mediterranean. The other basin collects the Wadys between et-Tih on the south, el-Ojmeh on the west, and el-Mûkrâh on the north, and is drained by the Wady el-

Jerâfeh, which runs N. E. into el-Arabah, towards the Dead Sea. The whole region between el-Jerâfeh and el-Arish, north of the range el-Mûkrâh, is filled with desolate mountains, which forbid any practicable road across them in the direction of Palestine. This is an important fact, as it goes far towards determining the route of the Israelites, and also that of the Roman road from Akabah to Gaza.

The particular stations of the Israelites cannot of course be determined; but from these volumes we derive an unexpected degree of satisfaction concerning their probable general course of travel. The sources of this probability are such as these. The physical character of a supposed station,—expressly described, or implied in the sacred narrative; its distance from some known point; the similarity of its Arabic name to the ancient Hebrew; or a concurrence of all these particulars goes to determine a few localities. These points being fixed, the progress of the Israelites from one to another is sometimes limited to certain roads by the physical character of the country,—the mountains and passes. Thus Sinai and Kadesh Barnea are two points whose relative position are known, and from the former there are two great routes leading in the direction of the latter. The western route leads over the elevated desert, and the eastern through the Wady el-Arabah. In their journey from Sinai, the third station of the Israelites was at Hazeroth. Burckhardt suggests—and Dr. Robinson concurs with him—that this name still exists, at the proper distance from Sinai, in the Arabic name of the fountain, 'Ain-Hûdherâh. If this be admitted, the track of the Israelites was probably by way of the gulf of Elath, and through the Arabah, since the sacred writer seems to imply that their course led along Mount Seir (Deut. 1: 2). Had they taken a route farther to the west, and passed around the range el-Mûkrâh, they would have arrived on the borders of Palestine at Beersheba, instead of Kadesh Barnea, which lay on the borders of Edom. By evidence such as this, also, Dr. R. is satisfied that the Roman road from Akabah to Gaza must have led up from the Wady el-Arabah to the desert, and passed west of Jebel el-Mûkrâh, and so on to Gaza. Indeed the nature of the ground compels the great routes leading north from Akabah to meet in the middle of the desert, in order to pass together around the range above mentioned. The route of the Roman road must have been determined by these physical causes. Consequently, with the distances laid down on the

Peutinger Table to guide him, Dr. R. knew where to look for the ancient stations ; and it was from such data as these, combined with the traces of the ancient names still distinguishable by an educated ear in the native appellations, that he discovered the probable remains of Lysa, Eboda and Elusa,—showing by their ruins, that Roman greatness once dwelt here amid the appliances of luxury and the strength of military power.

Our limits compel us to pass over much in these volumes that is of great interest to the biblical geographer. The travellers were six days passing from Sinai to Akabah, and seven from thence to Beersheba. The site of this ancient place seems to have been forgotten for centuries together, and during the last five, no western traveller appears to have found it until the visit of Robinson and Smith.*

On the 14th April, the travellers arrived at Jerusalem, and found a grateful repose in the houses of their countrymen, the Rev. Messrs. Whiting and Lanneau, missionaries of the American Board.

“The feelings of a Christian traveller on approaching Jerusalem can be better conceived than described. Mine were strongly excited. Before us, as we drew near, lay Zion, the Mount of Olives, the vales of Hinnom and Jehoshaphat, and other objects of the deepest interest ; while, crowning the summits of the same ancient hills, was spread out the city where God of old had dwelt, and where the Saviour of the world had lived and taught and died. From the earliest childhood I had read of and studied the localities of this sacred spot ; now I beheld them with my own eyes ; and they all seemed familiar to me, as if the realization of a former dream. I seemed to be again among cherished scenes of childhood, long unvisited, indeed, but distinctly recollected ; and it was almost a painful interruption, when my companion (who had been here before) began to point out and name the various objects in view.” Vol. I. p. 326.

Here a boundless field of investigation was open before them, and diligently did they explore it. They were almost constantly employed in exploring or taking bearings and measurements ; while the intervals of field labor were occupied with

* See Vol. I. p. 300, also Dr. Robinson's “Brief Report,” *Am. Bib. Repos.* April 1839, p. 309.

the comparison of ancient topographical authorities. We cannot, of course, even name all the results at which they arrived. The following are merely specimens.

They traced the origin, course and depth of the hollows and ravines, and the elevation and shape of the hills in and around Jerusalem. This laid the foundation for fixing many other points, since these physical causes must have had a bearing on the dimensions of the ancient city and the sites of its structures. They discovered or identified various remains of the ancient city, as it was before the days of Herod; such as the courses of immense stones in the walls of the area of the temple. They found the lower part of the tower of Hippicus, left standing by Titus; and were able to determine the position of the first wall, as well as the probable courses of the second and third walls. They proved that the area of the mosk of Omar is the same with that of the ancient temple, including the space covered by the castle Antonia; and that the reputed pool of Bethesda is probably but the remains of the trench which separated Antonia from the hill Bezetha. They investigated the internal resources of the city in respect to water, and ascertained how it was that in a rocky limestone region, almost destitute of water, the inhabitants were able, by means of reservoirs and cisterns, to sustain the privations of long sieges, while their enemies were greatly distressed with thirst. They suggest the probability of an ancient connection between the pools on the western side of the city, and the wells under the area of the mosk, and between these latter and the fountain of the Virgin, in the valley of Jehoshaphat. They personally explored and measured a subterranean passage cut in the solid rock, 1750 feet in length from the pool of Siloam to the fountain of the Virgin. They discredit the tradition which assigns to the church of the Holy Sepulchre the site of Calvary, and show that the tombs around the city have no title to the names applied to them, etc. etc.

Of all the researches of Dr. Robinson in Jerusalem, there is none which better illustrates the superiority of independent personal investigation above the blind credulity which trusts to the convents, than the discovery of an arch of the bridge which formerly connected the temple court with the Xystus, on Mount Zion. In one of his visits to the S. W. corner of the area of the mosk of Omar, he had observed several of the large stones jutting out from the western wall, which at first sight appeared to be the effect of some violent convulsion. The circum-

stance attracted just notice enough at the time to be remembered; and on mentioning it afterwards to the missionaries, it was found that they had noticed the same apparent displacement; and the remark was dropped that the stones had the appearance of having once belonged to a large arch. "At this remark," says Dr. Robinson,

"a train of thought flashed upon my mind, which I hardly dared to follow out, until I had again repaired to the spot, in order to satisfy myself with my own eyes, as to the truth or falsehood of the suggestion. I found it even so! The courses of these immense stones, which seemed at first to have sprung out from their places in the wall in consequence of some enormous violence, occupy nevertheless their original position; their external surface is hewn to a regular curve; and being fitted one upon another, they form the commencement or foot of an immense arch, which once sprung out from this western wall in a direction towards Mount Zion, across the valley of the Tyropoeon. This arch could only have belonged to THE BRIDGE, which according to Josephus led from this part of the temple to the Xystus on Zion; and it proves incontestably the antiquity of that portion of the wall from which it springs.

"The traces of this arch are too distinct and definite to be mistaken. Its southern side is thirty-nine English feet distant from the S. W. corner of the area, and the arch itself measures fifty-one feet along the wall. *Three* courses of its stones still remain; of which one is five feet four inches thick, and the others not much less. One of the stones is $20\frac{1}{2}$ feet long; another $24\frac{1}{2}$ feet; and the rest in like proportion. The part of the curve or arc, which remains, is of course but a fragment; but of this fragment the chord measures twelve feet six inches; the sine eleven feet ten inches; and the cosine three feet ten inches.—The distance from this point across the valley to the precipitous natural rock of Zion, we measured as exactly as the intervening field of prickly-pear would permit; and found it to be 350 feet or about 116 yards. This gives the proximate length of the ancient bridge. We sought carefully along the brow of Zion for traces of its western termination; but without success.

"Here then we have indisputable remains of Jewish antiquity, consisting of an important portion of the western wall of the ancient temple-area. They are probably to be referred to a period long antecedent to the days of Herod; for the labors

of this splendor-loving tyrant appear to have been confined to the body of the temple and the porticos around the court. The magnitude of the stones also, and the workmanship as compared with other remaining monuments of Herod, seem to point to an earlier origin. In the accounts we have of the destruction of the temple by the Chaldeans, and its rebuilding by Zerubbabel under Darius, no mention is made of these exterior walls. The former temple was destroyed by fire, which would not affect these foundations; nor is it probable that a feeble colony of returning exiles, could have accomplished works like these. There seems therefore little room for hesitation in referring them back to the days of Solomon, or rather of his successors; who, according to Josephus, built up here immense walls, 'immoveable for all time.' Ages upon ages have since rolled away; yet these foundations still endure, and are immoveable as at the beginning. Nor is there aught in the present physical condition of these remains, to prevent them from continuing as long as the world shall last. It was the temple of the living God; and, like the everlasting hills on which it stood, its foundations were laid 'for all time.'" Vol. I. pp. 425, 427.

The glory of Jerusalem has departed. From her ancient high estate as the civil metropolis of the Jewish commonwealth, and the religious centre of the whole Christian world,—“the joy of the whole earth,”—she has sunk into the neglected capital of a petty Turkish province. Dr. Robinson estimates the population as follows:—viz., 4,500 Mohammedans, 3,000 Jews, 3,500 Christians. To these are to be added for the convents and garrison about 500 more, making in all 11,500. This is the lowest estimate we have seen; though it must be acknowledged the data seem to be worthy of reliance.

“The markets are supplied by the peasants from the neighboring villages. There seemed to be no gardens of any importance round about the city; except those below Siloam. Wheat would appear not to grow well around Jerusalem, but is brought from other quarters. In one of our journies northward, we met a small caravan of camels belonging to Bethlehem, loaded with wheat from Nâbulus. The exhausted situation of the country arising from the maintenance of an immense army, the forced export of wheat to Egypt, and the general discouragement to labor and enterprise, have naturally

caused an enormous increase in the cost of the necessaries of life.

“Jerusalem has few manufactories, and no exports, except what is carried away by the pilgrims. The manufacture of soap is one of the principal. For this there are nine establishments, which appear to have been long in existence. The mounds of ashes, which they have thrown out at some distance from the city on the north, have almost the appearance of natural hills. At Easter large quantities of perfumed soap are said to be sold to the pilgrims. Oil of sesame is made to a considerable extent; for this there are nine presses. There is also a large tannery for leather, just by the eastern entrance to the court before the Church of the Sepulchre. All these establishments are private property, not controlled by the government; and are in the hands of the Muslims.

“The chief articles manufactured by the Christians, both here and at Bethlehem, are rosaries, crucifixes, models of the Holy Sepulchre, and the like, carved in olive-wood, the fruit of the Dôm-palm said to be brought from Mecca, mother of pearl, or sometimes in the species of black shining stone found near the Dead Sea.” Vol. II. pp. 95, 96.

After spending several weeks in investigating the antiquities of the Holy City, Dr. R. and his companion entered upon a series of excursions to explore the surrounding region. This might seem unnecessary in a part of the country so often visited; but it was, if possible, the more needful on that account, as great confusion and discrepancy prevail among the books of travels referring to the regions which they were now to investigate. To show the pains which had been taken to turn these excursions to the best account, we need only state that Mr. Smith had begun as early as 1834 to collect the native names of places in those parts which they hoped to visit. These names, being derived from the Arabs and corrected according to the best Arabic orthography, suggested many analogies to the Hebrew, and tended to the discovery or verification of many ancient sites. The value of these lists and the labor of their compilation may be inferred from the fact that they contain some 4000 names, filling eighty-five pages of the appendix.

The Muslim population, being separated from the Christian ecclesiastics both by religion and the want of a common language, have generally retained the ancient names, instead of

receiving those imposed by pilgrims. Hence the proper course, and that which Robinson and Smith pursued, was to rely almost entirely on the information of the Arabs, in connection with such hints as are furnished by the Scriptures, by the earlier writers on Palestine, and by their own observation. Acting on these principles, they made their first excursion into a region N. E. from Jerusalem, which seems to have been neglected by all foreign travellers. They were here rewarded by results of great value to biblical geography. They were able to trace out scenes and places associated with the names of Abraham and Jacob, of Samuel and Saul, of Jonathan and David, etc., and to tread almost in their very footsteps. It is impossible for the intelligent reader of the Bible to follow these travellers over the track by which the army of Sennacherib approached Jerusalem, without having a deeper impression of the truth of Bible history, and a more vivid perception of its eloquence and power.* Here they found "poor Anathoth" in a very different position from that assigned it by the monks; and also Gibeah of Saul, and Ramah, the home of Samuel. They descended into "the passage of Michmash," beyond which Rab-Shakeh "laid up his carriages," and over which he could not well have brought them (1 Sam. 13: 23, Is. 10: 28, 29); and passed by the two sharp rocks, Bozez and Seneh, over against Michmash and Gibeah, where Jonathan and his armor-bearer went up against the Philistines. They saw also the "Rock Rimmon," the conical hill to which the remnant of the Benjamites fled from the slaughter at Gibeah (Josh. 20: 45); and the long-lost Bethel, with its mountain on the east, where Abraham first pitched his tent in Palestine, and where Jacob slept and dreamed of angels (Gen. 12: 8, 28: 10—19). A few miles distant they found el-Jib on a ridge, and Yâlo near a noble valley, answering to Gibeon and the vale of Ajalon, where Joshua

* He is come to Aiath, he is passed to Migron; at Michmash he hath laid up his carriages: they are gone over the passage; they have taken up their lodging at Geba; Ramah is afraid; Gibeah of Saul is fled. Lift up thy voice, O daughter of Gallim: cause it to be heard unto Laish, O poor Anathoth. Madmenah is removed; the inhabitants of Gebim gather themselves to flee. As yet shall he remain at Nob that day: he shall shake his hand *against* the mount of the daughter of Zion, the hill of Jerusalem. Is. 10: 28—32.

commanded the sun and moon to stand still, while he chased the five kings towards the plain.

A second excursion of our travellers was to 'Ain-Jidy (Engedi) and the Dead Sea. In a single cluster on this route, they recovered—by the correspondence of the Arabic names with the Hebrew, in the very region required by the sacred narrative—the sites of no less than *nine* of the towns and mountains of Judah, nearly every one of which have remained unrecognized since the days of Jerome.

It is an interesting fact, and one that confirms the accuracy of the Scripture history, even in its minutest allusions, that Dr. R. found in existence customs which seem to annihilate thirty centuries of time, and bring the days of David and our own together. We subjoin a few specimens from the many with which this work abounds.

“In another tent a woman was kneeling and grinding at the hand-mill. These mills are doubtless those of scriptural times; and are similar to the Scottish *quern*. They consist of two stones about eighteen inches or two feet in diameter, lying one upon the other, with a slight convexity between them, and a hole through the upper to receive the grain. The lower stone is fixed, sometimes in a sort of cement, which rises around it like a bowl and receives the meal as it falls from the stones. The upper stone is turned upon the lower, by means of an upright stick fixed in it as a handle. We afterwards saw many of these mills; and saw only women grinding, sometimes one alone and sometimes two together. The female kneels or sits at her task, and turns the mill with both hands, feeding it occasionally with one. The labor is evidently hard; and the grating sound of the mill is heard at a distance, indicating (like our coffee-mills) the presence of a family and of household life. We heard no song as an accompaniment to the work.” Vol. II. pp. 180, 181.

Who can read this extract, without being reminded of our Saviour's prediction (Mat. 24: 41): “Two women shall be grinding at the mill; the one shall be taken and the other left?” The close of this account, also, illustrates the threatened desolation of Jerusalem (Is. 25: 10): “I will take from them the voice of mirth and the voice of gladness, the voice of the bridegroom and the voice of the bride, the sound of the mill-stones and the light of the candle.” So also, Rev. 19: 22.

The following extract will recall the shepherds of Bethlehem who were "abiding in the field, keeping watch over their flocks" (Luke 2: 8), and also the kind offices of Jacob, in rolling the stone from the mouth of the well of Haran (Gen. 29: 8—10).

"None of the houses were now inhabited ; all the people being abroad, dwelling in tents or caves, in order to watch their flocks and fields of grain. This is the custom of the peasants in this part of Palestine, during the months of pasturage in spring and until the crops are gathered ; while in autumn and winter they inhabit their villages. Cisterns excavated in the solid rock testify also to the antiquity of the site ; and the exterior of the rocks is in many places hewn smooth or scarped. Over most of the cisterns is laid a broad and thick flat stone, with a round hole cut in the middle, forming the mouth of the cistern. This hole we found in many cases covered with a heavy stone, which it would require two or three men to roll away." Vol. II. p. 188.

Again :

"Watchmen were stationed in various parts, to prevent cattle and flocks from trespassing upon the grain. The wheat was now ripening ; and we had here a beautiful illustration of Scripture. Our Arabs 'were an hungered,' and going into the fields, they 'plucked the ears of corn, and did eat, rubbing them in their hands.' On being questioned, they said this was an old custom, and no one would speak against it ; they were supposed to be hungry, and it was allowed as a charity. We saw this afterwards in repeated instances." Vol. II. p. 192.

Speaking of their visit to Kurmul (Carmel) near Hebron, Dr. Robinson remarks :

"We were here in the midst of scenes memorable of old for the adventures of David, during his wanderings in order to escape from the jealousy of Saul ; and we did not fail to peruse here, and with the deepest interest, the chapters of Scripture which record the history of those wanderings and adventures. Ziph and Maon gave their names to the desert on the East, as did also En-gedi ; and twice did the inhabitants of Ziph attempt to betray the youthful outlaw to the vengeance of his persecutor. At that time David and his men appear to have been very much in the condition of similar

outlaws at the present day ; for 'every one that was in distress, and every one that was in debt, and every one that was discontented gathered themselves unto him ; and he became a captain over them ; and there were with him about four hundred men.' They lurked in these deserts, associating with the herdsmen and shepherds of Nabal and others, and doing them good offices, probably in return for information and supplies obtained through them.

"Hence, when Nabal held his annual sheep-shearing in Carmel, David felt himself entitled to share in the festival ; and sent a message recounting his own services, and asking for a present : 'Wherefore let the young men find favor in thine eyes ; for we come in a good day ; give, I pray thee, whatsoever cometh to thine hand unto thy servants, and to thy son David.' In all these particulars we were deeply struck with the truth and strength of the biblical descriptions of manners and customs, almost identically the same as they exist at the present day. On such a festive occasion near a town or village, even in our own time, an Arab Sheikh of the neighboring desert would hardly fail to put in a word, either in person or by message ; and his message, both in form and substance, would be only the transcript of that of David." Vol. II. pp. 200, 201.

But our limits will not permit us to dwell further on the results of this excursion, nor on those of the subsequent exploration of the region south of the Dead Sea, and of the country of Samson, and the Pentapolis of the Philistines. The readers of the Repository have been apprized of the progress of biblical research in some of those regions, by the account of Burckhardt's journey to Wady Mûsa,* and of Legh's excursion to the same place,† as well as the correspondence of Dr. Robinson, published in the Repository for April, 1839.

On the 13th June, the travellers prepared to leave the Holy City. They had now been living for weeks in the exciting consciousness of communion with past ages. Kings, seers and holy men of old seemed to come back to their accustomed haunts, and to expound their own history, giving the circumstances of their acts and sayings with such clearness, that

* See Bib. Repos. Vol. II., July, 1832, pp. 597, etc., and October, 1832, pp. 759, etc.

† See Bib. Repos. October, 1833, pp. 615, etc.

the Scriptures in which they are preserved, seem to be not so much records of by-gone ages, as the contemporary journals of our own. If the feelings of our author were strongly excited on first beholding Jerusalem, before he had thus bathed his spirit in its hallowed associations, what must they have been when leaving it for the last time ! On his arrival, the salutation of the Psalmist was continually on his lips : " Peace be within thy walls and prosperity within thy palaces ;" and now, on his departure he could not but add : " For my brethren and companions' sakes, I will now say, peace be within thee !" " One long, last look ; and then, turning away," he " bade those sacred hills farewell, forever."

Their route northward was by the great road to Nâbulus. A few miles from Jerusalem, in Jifna Dr. Robinson recognized the Gophna of Josephus, with its paved Roman road,—a site that since the days of Eusebius seems to have been forgotten alike by explorers and by tradition itself, although only a mile from the most public route in Palestine. He found Shiloh—where once the ark abode—in just the situation described three thousand years ago, " on the north side of Bethel, on the east side of the highway that goeth up from Bethel to Shechem, and on the south of Lebonah," with all these places surviving to identify the site. At Nâbulus (Shechem) our travellers collected minute information concerning the antiquities and present state of the Samaritans. The plain of Esdraelon afforded an abundant harvest of valuable results, which will serve to extricate the topography of that region from the confusion and contradiction hitherto encumbering it.

No portion of these journals has interested us more than the record of researches around the sea of Tiberias. " Cinneroth," " Gennessaret," " the sea of Galilee," " Bahr Tûbariyeh"—how many ages are suggested by these various appellations ! Upon those waters walked the godlike form, whose presence awed the spirit of the tempest, and whose command the winds and the sea obeyed. Credulity may mistake the true position of other interesting objects, but concerning this sheet of water there is no deception. No other than this can be " the sea" upon whose shores the Saviour dwelt, and around which he so often went, and never went without leaving traces of his compassion, proofs of the divinity both of his power and his grace. Here most of his mighty works were done. The pious traveller cannot here set down his foot without the probability of placing

it where his Redeemer once trod. As he walks pensively along between the placid waves of Gennessaret and the impending mountain, he looks abroad on the same landscape, and may have the same enjoyment of its beauties that the human soul of Jesus received, when he beheld the sun rise over the waters, and the mist roll away up the western hills, or saw at evening the tall summit of Hermon still bathed in sunlight, after the shadows had settled down upon the hamlets on the shore. With what pity for the stupidity that would not feel, and the blindness that would not see, did that Saviour here utter the denunciations, "Wo unto thee, Chorazin; wo unto thee, Bethsaida!" "And thou, Capernaum, which art exalted unto heaven, shalt be brought down to hell; for if the mighty works which have been done in thee had been done in Sodom, it would have remained unto this day!" And who could survey the scene of these maledictions, and wander among the broken columns and capitals and pedestals of nameless ruins, all silent and lonely, or frequented only by the sons of Ishmael, without a thrill of awe, a solemn conviction of the truth that God hates sin—that from his denunciation there is no escape; that it makes no haste, and yet brooks no delay; but moves on as steadily as the foot of time, till it overwhelms the guilty rebel who incurs its wo!

It would be a pleasing task to accompany our travellers to Saphet and the sources of the Jordan, and thence through the ancient borders of Asher to the coasts of Tyre and Sidon; but our limits forbid. On the 8th of July, 1838, they sailed from Beyrout, and passed by Smyrna and Constantinople, through the Black Sea, and up the Danube to Vienna. Here our author was brought to the borders of the grave by a fever contracted during the voyage.

The two following years were spent by Dr. Robinson at Berlin in the preparation of his various materials for the public eye. There, "in the unrestricted use of that noble institution, the Royal Library, and of the very valuable private collections of Ritter, Neander and Hengstenberg," he had every facility for comparing the results of his journey with whatever has survived concerning the Holy Land in previous writers, both ecclesiastical and secular.

In taking a general view of the service which these researches have done for the cause of sacred literature, we notice:

First, the *geographical results*. No single expedition has ever contributed so large an amount of materials for the rectification of Scripture geography ; nor have any previous travellers employed such unwearied pains to verify the results of those who have gone before them. Their instruments were constantly in their hands ; every inflection of their path was noted on the spot ; the time of arrival and departure from every point of interest, and the rate of travel were carefully preserved ; thousands of bearings of mountains, towns, etc., were taken, and all are carefully wrought into their maps on scientific principles. As evidence of the industry and perseverance exhibited in this journey, we find that there are notices in these volumes, of more than a *hundred sites* of towns and other objects *discovered*, or described and their identity for the first time rendered probable by Robinson and Smith.

The *mode* of observation pursued by Dr. R. is, if we mistake not, quite novel, and has had no small share in the geographical value of his work. We allude to the constant habit of noticing the *Wadys*, or water courses,—their depth and direction, and the relation of other objects to them. In this way, he has overspread the regions through which he passed with a tissue of vallies and ranges of hills, that by their position determine many questions of great interest. Thus, for example, we are now for the first time assured of the shape of the desert, by the patient collection of facts showing the drainage of its surface through the smaller depressions into the two great Wadys, el-Arish and el-Jeráfah, running northward. The careful reader will notice other illustrations of the advantages of this peculiar mode of describing a country by the size and direction of its hollows, particularly in the account of Jerusalem and its vicinity.

Another source, from which much of the value of these researches is derived, was the combination in these travellers of the profound literary preparation of the one, with the familiar acquaintance of the other with the vernacular Arabic. A single illustration will set this in a just light. When our travellers were approaching Palestine across the desert, believing themselves to be on the route of the Roman road, they searched for the ancient stations, and among others for *Elusa*. And the manner of their discovering it was this : Jerome (Com. on Is. 15: 4) intimates that the Aramean name of this city was חֲלֻצָה (Chálutzah), which was softened by the Greeks into *Ἐλουσα*

(*Elusa*). It naturally occurred to our travellers that if this name survives among the Arabs at the present day, it must be in a form which resembles the cognate Aramean. What then, they inquired, would the name mentioned by Jerome become, when modified by Arab organs? This was a question which Mr. Smith at once answered by changing the word to Khūlah-sah. This, then, was the name that was to be sought, if the memory of the place had not utterly perished; and this was the very name given by the Arabs to the ruins found at the Wady el-Kūrn. Now it is apparent, that had not one of these travellers been thoroughly imbued with sacred literature, he would not have derived this hint from Jerome; nor would the hint have been available, had not the other been expert in the Arabic as now spoken in Palestine.

That we do not too highly estimate the value of these volumes to sacred geography, is shown by the testimony of Kiepert, the cartographer of Berlin, by whom the maps were constructed. He declares that "the routes of Robinson and Smith, in minute specifications of every kind, leave far behind them the reports of all other oriental travellers, even of Burckhardt himself;" that the maps and plans of Laborde and the Itinerary of Burckhardt "can make no pretension to the same degree of correctness as those of our travellers," and that Laborde's delineation of the region of Sinai "does not correspond to a single one of the exact bearings" taken by Robinson and Smith, "and may be pronounced a complete failure," etc. Even the great route from Jerusalem to Nazareth, though so often travelled and described, is now for the first time accurately constructed, and the true position of important places, such as Samaria, Nābulus and Jenīn assigned to them.

But there is another characteristic of this great work, which enhances its value in our estimation; we mean its abundant *historical illustrations*. In his notice of almost every place which he describes, the author gives a connected sketch of its history, so far as any materials can be found in classical or ecclesiastical writers, ancient itineraries, Arabian geographers, or modern travels. Although, at first view, it may seem to impair the unity of the work, we are convinced, on further reflection, that there is great propriety in the introduction of this historical matter in connection with the places to which it refers. It thus possesses an interest and value which it would not have in a separate form. And besides, few men, espe-

cially in this country, can have access to the literary facilities which Dr. R. enjoyed in Europe. He has done well, therefore, when the materials of history were within his reach, to collect them for the benefit of less favored scholars. The labor and research evinced in this portion of the work are prodigious; and we venture to say that these illustrations, with the appended notes, form the most complete index to whatever may be known of the history of Palestine, that can anywhere be found; and, in reference to the places visited by our travellers, leave little to be desired and almost nothing to be gleaned by succeeding laborers in the same field. As a specimen of these historical results the account of Jerusalem may be particularly named. We are not aware that there exists anywhere else among the innumerable works of geographers, annalists and travellers, so complete an account of the Holy City in the successive ages of its eventful history. This is not wholly owing to the lack of materials—though these are indeed less copious than could be desired—but to their dispersion through rare authorities and the labor of searching them out; and, moreover, the few authentic facts have been overlaid by mountains of traditionary lore, heaped up by successive generations of pilgrims. Dr. Robinson has successfully analyzed these traditions, and fixed the canons by which it may be determined what is to be regarded as truthful and what is only the offspring of credulity or fraud. In the application of these rules he spoils many an interesting fable which long currency had almost authorized as fact; but for what we lose in this way, we are compensated by the feeling of repose with which we rest in the conclusions of the author,—the conviction that what is now given us may be relied on as truth, and nothing but the truth, and as nearly the *whole* truth as the nature of the case allows.

We must not omit to mention the valuable appendixes to these volumes, particularly to the third. These contain, among other things, a chronological *list of works* on Palestine and Mount Sinai, with a brief account of each; a scientific *memoir on the maps*, by H. Kiepert, the constructor; the *itineraries* of the travellers, being the field notes of the routes, rate of travel, meteorological remarks, etc. for every day; an essay, by Rev. E. Smith, on the *pronunciation of the Arabic*; and also the extensive tables, already alluded to, of *names of places* in Palestine and its vicinity, arranged according to the civil divisions

of the country. The maps, as well as the letter-press, are executed in a style corresponding with the importance of the information they are designed to impart.

It is a subject for thankfulness to the great Fountain of Truth, that this important undertaking has been so successfully accomplished,—that the men were prepared for it, and carried through it, and enabled to lay the results before the public with all the completeness of deliberate study. We congratulate them on this consummation as alone an object worthy the aim and effort of their whole lives. And though they modestly confess the incompleteness of their survey of the Promised Land, they have done more than any who have gone before them, and left a model of accuracy and diligence for the imitation of those who may succeed them. We congratulate the friends of sound learning on the production by our own countrymen of a work of such genuine erudition, which will not only add to the reputation of our national literature, but also stimulate the youthful clergy of our land, more than any foreign production could do, to aim at a thorough scholarship. And, finally, we congratulate the brotherhood of believers on the clearer evidence and brighter light which these volumes shed on the sacred word; showing that it is no cunningly devised fable; but, by the correspondence of a thousand allusions with existing facts, is demonstrated to be the genuine record of the men, places, and scenes, and modes of thought, and sources of feeling, that it professes to be. Even its mysteries are many of them but the result of our ignorance, and are destined yet to be resolved when *sanctified learning* shall go forth into all the world, and from the history of every nation, from records, ruins, inscriptions and coins, from the tribes of animals and from the structure of the globe itself, shall gather the materials for illustrating the word of God.

ARTICLE IX.

THE NESTORIANS.

By Edward Robinson, D. D., Professor of Bib. Lit., Union Theol. Sem., New-York.

The Nestorians, or the Lost Tribes ; containing evidence of their identity, etc. By Asahel Grant, M. D. New-York : Harper & Brothers. 1841. 12mo. pp. 385.

THE remnant of the great Nestorian sect, which once extended over a large part of Asia, and pushed its missions and its churches unto the remotest east, to India and China, is now confined to the wild mountains of Kurdistan, lying between Mesopotamia and Persia, and blocking up the direct passage between those countries. In this almost inaccessible retreat, the Nestorians have for ages defied the storms of revolution and of desolation that have swept over the adjacent regions; and, in their character of bold and intrepid, though rude and fierce mountaineers, have so entirely maintained their independence unto the present day, as to bear among their neighbors the proud title of *Ashiret*, "the Tributeless." These mountains are their chief seat and home; but on the east, they have descended to occupy in part the fertile plains which border the Lake of Ooroomiah and surround the city of the same name, the reputed birth-place of Zoroaster; while on the west they are also found in the cities and villages of the vast plains through which the Tigris rolls its course. Until quite recently, these mountain districts have remained unexplored and unvisited by Europeans; and travellers have come in contact with this people only at their extremities, upon the plains of the east and west. In the latter quarter, in the region of Mosul, the missionaries of the Romish church have for centuries assailed them with zeal and at last with success. In the seventeenth century, their western patriarch gave in his adhesion to the pope, who, in return, bestowed upon him and his followers the venerable but

unmeaning name of Chaldeans.* The change indeed was hardly more than nominal; consisting merely in a few names of saints and the dropping of a few sentences of their creed and liturgy; and probably was adopted more in the hope of protection and aid from a supposed great occidental power, than from any definite conviction. The patriarch of the mountains still remains steadfast in his ancient faith; and among his followers in the plain of Ooroomiah, within the last eight years, American missionaries have taken up their abode. They were received with unexampled kindness and respect, and have already met with a success which could never have been anticipated; and have brought out to view facts and information respecting the country and the people, which throw new light upon the history of that portion of the globe.

The Nestorians are remarkable for having preserved during the dark ages a purer faith and a brighter missionary zeal, than any of the other churches of the east or west. In the west, indeed, amid all those centuries of superstition, papal domination, and fierce contention, the existence of the Nestorians appears almost to have been forgotten; while at that very time their missionary efforts in the east were in a high degree enterprising and successful, stretching over the long interval from the seventh to the fourteenth century. Their churches in the remote east, however, mostly perished in the convulsions and revolutions brought about by the Muhammedan conquerors, Gengis Khan and Tamerlane; and the papal missionaries, who were sent not long after into China and the adjacent regions, profess to have found no traces of a former Christianity. The Nestorians of Mesopotamia having been themselves partially won over to the pope in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the materials for their ecclesiastical history became so far known, that the learned Assemani, more than a century ago, could occupy the whole third and fourth parts of his great work with treatises upon the religious literature, history, and polity of this interesting people.† In respect to their present character and

* A more appropriate name would have been *papal Nestorians* or *Nestorian-Catholics*; analogous to the Greek-Catholics, Armenian-Catholics, Syrian-Catholics, etc.

† Assemani *Bibliotheca Orientalis*, Tom. iii. Pars i, ii. Romae 1725-28. A brief but very complete abstract of the history of their missionary efforts was published in the *Mis-*

condition, at least that portion of them dwelling in the plain of Ooroomiah, we have full information in the Researches of Messrs. Smith and Dwight, the Reports of the Mission scattered through the volumes of the Missionary Herald since 1834, and especially in the valuable article from the pen of the Rev. J. Perkins, in the American Biblical Repository for January of the present year.

One important circumstance, first brought to light by Smith and Dwight, and substantiated by the subsequent labors of the Mission, is the fact, that the venerable Syriac, which has long been supposed by scholars to have become a dead language,* still exists in a corrupted form as the living vernacular tongue of the Nestorian Christians. Niebuhr, indeed, with his accustomed accuracy, relates the same fact as to the villages around Mosul; but this was contradicted by Volney, and no traveller had since taken the trouble to inquire after the truth.† Messrs. Smith and Dwight found in the villages in the region of Ooroomiah the same vernacular unwritten language of the common people; while all the church books were in the ancient Syriac, written in a peculiar character varying slightly from the Estrangelo.‡ In the village of Khosrova, inhabited by Chaldeans (i. e. Nestorian-Catholics), they met with a bishop and priest, both of whom had been educated at Rome, where the latter had spent twelve years in the College of the Propaganda. He had begun to write down the vulgar language, and had translated into it for the use of his pupils the *Doctrina Christiana* (a papal catechism) and a few prayers. These were the only books then existing in the vulgar language of the Nestorians.§ The travellers obtained copies of them; and also a copy of the Nestorian alphabet with the sounds exemplified. These tracts,

sionary Herald for August 1838, drawn up by the Rev. Dr. Anderson, one of the secretaries of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions.

* Hoffmann Gramm. Syr. pp. 35, 36.

† Niebuhr Reisebeschr. II. p. 352, "Die allgemeine Sprache auf den christlichen Dörfern dieser Gegend (Mosul) ist noch auf diesen Tag Syriaisch. Das jetzige Syrische oder Chaldäische aber soll wenigstens eben so sehr von der Sprache verschieden sein, worinn die Kirchenbücher geschrieben sind, als das neu Arabische vom alten." Comp. Hoffmann, l. c. Volney, Voyage en Syrie, I. p. 331.

‡ Researches, II. p. 212.

§ Ibid. p. 192.

through the kindness of Mr. Smith and Dr. Anderson, came afterwards into the possession of the writer of this article ; but the entire want of all the necessary literary helps in this country, precluded the possibility of making any use of them. In 1837 he put them into the hands of the distinguished orientalist, Prof. Roediger of Halle ; who by a singular concurrence was at the same time, in connection with Pott of Halle, investigating the neighboring language of the Kurds.* Partly at his request, a letter to Mr. Perkins was afterwards sent by the writer from Constantinople, requesting further information as to the language, and also such other specimens of it as could be obtained. An answer to this letter was received some months later in Berlin, with a package of tracts both in the modern and ancient language. As the letter of Mr. Perkins presents a more full and distinct account of the language and literature of the Nestorians than has yet been given to the public, no apology is necessary for inserting it here.

Ooroomiah, Nov. 14th, 1838.

MY VERY DEAR SIR :

A short time since, I had the sincere gratification of receiving your kind letter, dated Constantinople, Aug. 11th. It gives me great pleasure to comply with your request so far as I am able, in communicating to you information respecting the language of the Nestorians.

The *ancient* language of the Nestorians of Persia and of the Kurdish mountains is the ancient *Syriac* ;† and this is still their *book-language*. Not only their liturgy, but *all* their books are written in the Syriac. And their ecclesiastics, who are but very imperfectly instructed, conduct their written correspondence in Syriac, and are able to converse in it with each other. The common written character of the Nestorians resembles the Estrangelo. They still have some few ancient books written in the Estrangelo ; and they now use the Estrangelo for their capital letters.

* *Kurdische Studien*, in *Zeitschrift zur Kunde des Morgenlandes*, III. p. 1.

† By the term *Syriac*, I intend the *ancient* Syriac, whether the signification "ancient" be supplied or not ; save where the term "modern," is prefixed in one instance. J. P.

The so-called "Chaldeans" of Mesopotamia received that title, as you know, from the pope, on their becoming Catholics. *Their* ancient language is also the Syriac, and their written character was the same with that of the Nestorians; except among that portion of them who were converted from the Jacobite sect, who, I believe, use the common Syriac character familiar to European scholars. These "Chaldeans" all used the ancient Syriac as their written language, until their modern conversion to popery. Since that event, some of their books have been prepared in the Arabic tongue; in order, as is supposed, that the people, having abandoned their own ancient language and literature, may be the more easily induced to embrace all the peculiarities of the papal church. I am informed, however, that their liturgy is still in the ancient Syriac, among many of the Chaldean villages of Mesopotamia.

The above statements in reference to the language of the Chaldeans of Mesopotamia have been repeatedly made to me by individuals of their own people. They have also just been confirmed by a Chaldean deacon from the region of Mosul, who recently arrived here, and has spent a considerable part of his time, during the past week, in my study.

The *spoken* language of the Nestorians of Persia and of the Kurdish mountains is derived directly from the ancient Syriac. It differs somewhat in different regions. According as a given district is situated in the vicinity of the Turks, Kurds, or Persians, the language has become corrupted by the introduction of a great number of words and phrases, borrowed from the languages of those nations respectively; and thus differs much more widely from the ancient Syriac, than the dialects spoken by some of the independent Nestorians of the Kurdish mountains, who have come less in contact with these barbarizing influences. In all these regions, however, the *body* of the spoken language of the Nestorians comes from the ancient Syriac, as obviously and directly as the modern Greek comes from the ancient Greek.

The "Chaldeans" of Mesopotamia are also said to have formerly spoken a corruption of the Syriac. At present most of them are said to use Arabic, particularly in and about the city of Mosul. In some of the villages, however, they still speak a corrupted Syriac,—the same that is spoken by the Nestorians of Ooroomiah, save that it approaches nearer to the ancient language. It was undoubtedly this language which Niebuhr

heard in some of those villages and pronounced to be "Chaldean."* The deacon above named is from a village about fifteen miles distant from Mosul. He states that the inhabitants of that village and others in the vicinity usually speak corrupt Syriac instead of the Arabic. His own dialect differs but little from that spoken here.†

Of the difference between the ancient Chaldaic language and the Syriac, you are of course better qualified to judge than I am. I feel quite clear, however, in reference to the points which I have stated above, viz. that the *ancient* language of both the Nestorians and the present "Chaldeans" is the same, —and that, the ancient *Syriac*; also, that the *spoken* language of the Nestorians and of these "Chaldeans" is the same, (except so far as the Arabic prevails among the latter,) and that it is derived directly from the ancient *Syriac*.‡

I have almost constant occasion to notice the very strong relationship which exists between all these cognate Semitic languages, as the Hebrew, Arabic, Syriac, etc. The Nestorian ecclesiastics, for example, very easily learn the Hebrew language, from its resemblance to their own. I have, at present, a class of these ecclesiastics in Hebrew, whose proficiency, with

* Niebuhr, however, calls it *Syrianisch*; see the Note on p. 456, above. R.

† The very same statements respecting the language of the papal Nestorians in the villages around Mosul, were made to the writer at Constantinople in 1838, by Mr. Rassam, now British Consul at Mosul, himself a native "Chaldean" from that city or the vicinity. R.

‡ In the article above referred to, (Am. Bib. Repos. Jan. 1841, p. 12,) Mr. Perkins remarks that he and his colleague, Mr. Holladay, "have taken some pains to compare the language of the Nestorians with the Chaldaic, as exhibited in the books of Daniel and Ezra, and at the same time with the ancient Syriac of those portions of Scripture; and the result has been a most decided preponderance in favor of deriving the modern language directly from the Syriac." I cite this in order to subjoin the remark, that the Chaldaic of Daniel and Ezra is hardly a fair standard of comparison, since it approaches much nearer to the Hebrew than does the ordinary Chaldee dialect. The comparison should rather have been made with some portion of the Chaldee translations exhibited in the Targums. R.

very little effort, is such as would do honor to an Andover lecture-room. There are also Jews in this city who speak a corrupt dialect of the Hebrew ; and their language so nearly resembles that spoken by the Nestorians, that individuals of the two nations can readily understand each other.

The *spoken* language of the Nestorians has scarcely been reduced to writing by themselves. Hence, as I have said above, the epistolary correspondence is still conducted in their ancient language, the Syriac. I find, too, by referring to Mr. Smith's "Researches," that the manuscripts which he procured here, were the only works, as he supposed, existing in the spoken language.* I have found no other manuscripts prepared in the vulgar tongue in this region. I obtained, some time since, from the vicinity of Mosul, what purported to be a translation of a part of the Gospels, into the spoken language. It proved to me that the "Chaldeans" of the villages in that region speak a corrupted Syriac ; but the preparation of the work was so entirely without rule or standard in construction, orthography, etc., as to prove, also, that the spoken language of the Nestorians and Chaldeans has been as little cultivated on the western, as on the eastern side of the Kurdish mountains.

We regard the necessity of cultivating the spoken language of the Nestorians as so obvious and great, in order to reach the mass of the people with religious and intellectual matter, that I long since commenced reducing it to writing. I have made a translation of some parts of the Scriptures, of a small geography, and of some other things, into the language. Our translations are doubtless still imperfect in orthography as well as in other respects ; as I have had no standard to aid me, but the Syriac language. In the hope, however, that they may gratify you and your German friends, and afford you some light, I will send you a few specimens of which we have duplicates. We have as yet printed nothing. Our press is now on the way to this country.† As I send by the English post, I can forward

* Vol. II. p. 192. See above, p. 456.

† In consequence of many delays, the press did not reach Ooroomiah until Nov. 1840. The following entries in Mr. Perkins' journal of that month, show the joy with which it was welcomed.

"Nov. 7th, 1840.—Our printer, Mr. Breath, arrived. His coming with the press is, we believe, the dawn of a new era on the Nestorians.—9th. We took the press from the boxes in

but few manuscripts at this time ; but will endeavor to send more, together with some manuscripts in the ancient language, when an opportunity for transportation shall occur. Lying on my table are two letters which I lately received ; one from the Patriarch and one from a bishop. I send you these also with a translation. They are in the ancient language, i. e. the ancient Syriac.

You are doubtless aware that the British and Foreign Bible Society has published the entire Scriptures in the Syriac language. Only the four Gospels, however, are in the Nestorian character. These were published in the year 1829. The type is very perfect. Have you seen a copy of these Gospels ?

The idea is sometimes suggested, that these corrupt languages, —such for instance as the modern Greek, the modern Armenian, the modern Syriac, etc.—ought not to be reduced to writing ; that only the *ancient* languages should be cultivated ; and that thus, by general education, the people of these nations may be led back to the re-adoption of their respective ancient tongues. What is your opinion on this subject ?

It has appeared to us obviously impossible ever to effect the object which the theory proposes in reference to the Nestorians. The mass of the people understand almost none of the pure Syriac, unmodified by vulgar contractions and inversions, and by the importation of barbarisms. We, however, encourage the cultivation of the old Syriac, as well as of the spoken language. We wish the Nestorians to contrive to study and use it in some measure ; and we hope that by regarding it and using it as their *classical* language, they may be able to cultivate and enrich their vulgar tongue. Can we do better than adopt such a course ?

When our press and type reach us, we design to print an

which it was brought, and set it up. It appears like an exotic in this dark and distant land ; and, at the same time, like a familiar old acquaintance, whose arrival is inexpressibly welcome to us.—21st. We put our press in operation by printing on small scraps, a few copies of the Lord's Prayer in ancient Syriac, merely to gratify the curiosity of the natives, who have never before seen any thing of the kind. The press is now the *lion* here. Numbers call daily to visit it. The Nestorians are greatly delighted with it." See Mission. Herald, Sept. 1841, p. 351. R.

edition of the entire Syriac Scriptures in the Nestorian character. From this you will infer, that we do not wish the Nestorians to cease cultivating that noble language.

With my kind regards to Prof. Roediger, please assure him that it will ever afford me great pleasure, to do all in my power to facilitate his inquiries in reference to these eastern languages.

Yours, most truly,

JUSTIN PERKINS.

P. S. Nov. 23d. I have just found among my papers two other letters from the Patriarch, both in the ancient Syriac, which I send, with translations.

From the reply made to this letter, Mr. Perkins has given the following extracts: * "The views contained in your letter, leave no room to doubt of the character of the language; nor that the Chaldean, so called, of Mesopotamia, is the same. I have myself had no doubt of this before; although on inquiring of Mr. Rassam and others in Constantinople, I could get no satisfactory information. The prevailing view among scholars, at present, is that the ancient Chaldee and Syriac are, at the bottom, the same dialect; the former having developed itself in a more Jewish form, and adopted the Hebrew alphabet, and the latter having been diffused among Christians with a different alphabet; i. e. one being a Hebraizing Aramæan and the other a Christian Aramæan. A similar fact exists at this day, in relation to the Servian and Illyrian languages. They are the same, or nearly so, as spoken; but the Servians are Greek Christians, and use a peculiar alphabet; while the Illyrians are Catholics, and write with the Latin letters.†

"There can be no doubt, I think, as to the propriety and necessity of cultivating the modern Syriac, in the manner you mention, any more than there is in the case of the modern Greek. It is the language, and the only language of the people, and must remain so; though it should be purified and refined, by a reference to the ancient language, so far as possible."

* Amer. Bibl. Repos., Jan. 1841, pp. 11, 12.

† Very recently an alphabet has been proposed by Mr. Gai, an Illyrian scholar, adapted to both his own and the Servian lan-

The preceding letter of Mr. Perkins was accompanied by a small package, containing five or six scriptural tracts in the modern language of the Nestorians, and the four letters there mentioned in ancient Syriac. The tracts comprised translations of the Sermon on the Mount, and some of the minor epistles. Three of the letters were from the Patriarch of the mountains, who always takes the name or rather the title of Mar Shimon, i. e., Lord Simeon. He resides not far from Jalamerk in the Hakkary district, one of the most inaccessible parts of the Kurdish mountains. One of the letters bears his great seal; the other two have only his smaller private seal. All were written by amanuenses; one of them by the priest Abraham of Ashita, who was afterwards visited by Dr. Grant, and is described as the most learned Nestorian now living. The contents of all the letters are unimportant and even trivial; consisting chiefly of high-flown oriental compliments and expressions of thanks, under which the all-pervading oriental feeling of self-interest is not always concealed. Their chief value is as proofs of the good soil into which the missionary seed has here been cast.

The arrival of these literary documents in Berlin, from the wild and almost unapproachable mountains of Kurdistan, the fierce seats of robbery and bloodshed, where the traveller Schulz a few years before had been foully murdered on attempting to enter the region, awakened great interest among the German literati. The celebrated and excellent Ritter, who since the death of Rennell occupies the geographical throne, drew up with the help of these papers an account of the country and the people, which he read before one or two literary societies, and also before the present king of Prussia, then crown prince; and afterwards inserted the substance of it in his great published work, accompanied by translations of two of the Syriac letters sent by Mr. Perkins.* The documents were ultimately all placed in the hands of Prof. Roediger of Halle, where they yet remain; and he has since succeeded in obtaining a few others from different sources. He has as yet made public only the *Creed*, printed in the common Syriac character, with a commentary and remarks on the language, and then later, two of

guages, which would do away almost the only distinction between the two. It has been readily adopted by the Illyrians, but seems to find little favor with the Servians. R.

* Ritter's *Erdkunde*, Th. IX. pp. 670—687, Berlin, 1840.

the letters in ancient Syriac forwarded by Mr. Perkins, in the same character, with remarks.*

According to Roediger's judgment, the broad foundation of this modern Syriac, is the ancient Aramæan (of which, as we have seen, the ancient Chaldee and Syriac were probably little more than different alphabets), but greatly corrupted in its organization. The sounds are for the most part exceedingly softened and weakened; very often contracted; and some again have passed over to a barbarian harshness.† Many later foreign words are also intermixed from the Arabic, Persian, and Kurdish languages. The ancient Syriac of the letters has likewise some peculiarity. Many anomalies appear in the use of the vowels; which serve to show that the language, in its ancient correct form, is no longer the living property of the writer. Modern words, too, from the Arabic and Persian, are occasionally introduced.

The arrival of the press at Ooroomiah will doubtless greatly tend to fix and extend the modern language and literature of the Nestorians, and multiply its materials; and, with these more ample means, we may hope that the philology of the language and the intellectual character of the people will speedily become more developed and more widely known.

After these remarks upon the language of the Nestorians, we turn to the work of Dr. Grant named at the head of this article. It describes the first successful attempt to explore the mountainous district inhabited by the independent tribes of the same people. We premise a brief notice of what was already known respecting the region.

The independent Nestorians, in the midst of their wild mountain fastnesses, are rendered still more inaccessible from the fact, that they are surrounded and hemmed in on every side by tribes

* See Roediger über die aramäische Vulgairsprache der heutigen Syrischen Christen, in *Zeitschr. für die Kunde des Morgenlandes*, Bd. II. pp. 77—93. Also: *Syrische Briefe*, *ibid.* Bd. III. pp. 218—225. A short form of prayer in modern Syriac is also given by Roediger in his *Syrische Chrestomathie*, Halle, 1838.

† "In roughness of sound, it exceeded even the Armenian. I was able soon to detect in it many Arabic and Hebrew words; but rarely enough to complete the meaning of a sentence. Almost every word seemed to end in a vowel." *Smith's Researches*, II. p. 212.

of ferocious Kurds; their territory indeed being the very heart of Kurdistan. Between them and the district of Salmas and Ooroomiah, along the water-shed between the streams flowing to the lake of Ooroomiah, and those running to the Tigris, dwell the Kurds of the Hakkary district, reported the fiercest of all. On the S. W. of the mountains, towards the Tigris, the Turkish power has of late years made some progress, and partially subjected several of the petty Kurdish tribes and some fortresses to its sway; so that access to the mountains is on that side more open.

The first account of this country in modern times is from the Catholic missionaries who were sent to the Kurds on the western side of the mountains. Pater Leopold Soldini, a Dominican, went thither in 1760, and died in 1779 at Zakhu, situated, according to Dr. Grant, on an island in the river Khabûr, not far above its entrance into the Tigris. He was followed by Pater M. Garzoni, who fixed himself at Amadieh, where he remained twenty-eight years, devoting himself to missionary labors among the Kurds, and to the study of their language, of which he prepared and published a grammar. His accounts of the country and people are very scanty.*—About the same time, the accurate Niebuhr, on his route through Mosul, gathered information in respect to several of the districts of this part of Kurdistan, which subsequent inquiry has only served to confirm.†

In the present century, the indefatigable Mr. Rich collected much valuable information respecting the same region; and gives also the route of a Tatar courier by way of Amadieh and Jûlamerk to the lake of Van, corresponding almost entirely to the subsequent route of Dr. Grant.‡ Accounts of a similar kind were gathered by Lieut. Col. Monteith in Persia, and by Dr. Walsh in Constantinople.§ The researches of Smith and Dwight, which led to the establishment of the American mis-

* P. M. Garzoni *Grammatica e Vocabulario della lingua Kurda*, Roma 1787. Roediger and Pott *Kurdische Studien*, in *Zeitschr. für die Kunde des Morgenl.* Bd. III. p. 1—17. Ritter's *Erdkunde* Th. IX. p. 656.

† Niebuhr *Reisebeschr.* II. p. 332.

‡ C. J. Rich, *Narrative a Residence in Koordistan*, I. pp. 275—280. Lond. 1836. Ritter, l. c. pp. 659—663.

§ *Journ. of the Roy. Geogr. Soc.* Lond. Vol. III. 1833. pp. 52—54. Ritter, l. c. pp. 664—670.

sion among the Nestorians of Ooroomiah, brought out also further information respecting their more independent brethren in the mountains.* In 1829, the orientalist Schulz appears to have reached Jûlamerk from the east; but was treacherously murdered on his return. Dr. Grant visited the scene of the murder, and recounts the causes which led to it.†

The residence of the missionaries at Ooroomiah brought them of course into occasional contact with the Nestorians of the mountains, who often visit their brethren of the plain. We have already seen from the letters of the Patriarch, that he held correspondence with them, and that he took an interest in their proceedings. Many repaired also to Ooroomiah to visit the mission, or to avail themselves of the medical services of Dr. Grant; and thus opportunity was afforded for cultivating a kind feeling towards the mission among the mountains, and gradually preparing the way for future personal inquiry and the establishment of schools in those districts. Indeed, so pressing did the Patriarch and his followers become on this latter point, that it was thought advisable both by the missionaries on the spot, and by the board at home, that an attempt to penetrate the country should no longer be deferred. Accordingly, in April 1839, Dr. Grant, in pursuance of instructions from home, set off on this journey. It had been his wish to enter the mountains from the east; but the other approach from the west was deemed the most feasible; and, after visiting Constantinople, and returning by way of Diarbekr and Mardin to Mosul, he left that city on the 7th of October, for Amadieh, near the great elbow of the Zâb (the ancient Zabûs or Zabatus), formerly a Kurdish fortress, but now held by the Turks.

The direct route to Amadieh lies through Râs el-'Ain and Elkôsh, and then across the chain of mountains, which here causes the Zâb to make nearly a right angle towards the east. But for the purpose of obtaining the protection of a Kurdish chieftain, Dr. Grant proceeded first to Akra, N. E. of Mosul, and thence up the valley of the Hazir (the ancient Bumadus),

* Vol. II. p. 217, seq.

† Page 123. The information previously received respecting his death, see in Ritter's *Erdkunde*, Th. IX. pp. 649-653. The papers of Schulz, relating to the languages of those countries, are understood to be in the hands of the distinguished orientalist, Prof. Jul. Mohl of Paris.

crossing the mountains at its source. The remaining route of the traveller lay up along, or near the valley of the Zab; sometimes upon its banks, and sometimes at a distance across the precipitous mountain ranges, lying between its lateral streams. He passed near Jûlamerk; and reaching the residence of the Patriarch on the opposite side of the river, Oct. 26th, remained for five weeks the guest of that dignitary, enjoying his hospitality, and being treated in all things as a friend and brother. Dr. G. now proceeded to Bash Kala, the residence, at the time, of the principal chief of the Hakkary Kurds; the same indeed by whose orders or connivance Schulz was murdered. He found the chieftain ill; was enabled by his medicines to relieve him; and thus established himself firmly in his favor. No further difficulty of course lay before him; and crossing the mountains from the sources of the Zab to Salmas, he reached Ooroomiah on the 7th of December.

In returning to Constantinople on his way to this country, Dr. Grant again visited the higher or northeastern part of the same territory. Leaving Ooroomiah May 7th, 1840, with his little son of four years old, he travelled over the mountains still covered with snow, and across the higher branches of the Zab to Bash Kala; thence to Jûlamerk, where the Patriarch was then residing; again by another route to Bash Kala; which place he left June 1st, to pass around the eastern shore of the Lake of Van on his way to Constantinople.

It is not our purpose to make any extracts from this portion of the work. The whole account of the journey and of Dr. Grant's intercourse with the people occupies only one hundred pages; it is animated, graphic, and exceedingly interesting; and could not be abridged without injustice. It is sufficient to remark, that he was everywhere received with the utmost kindness, and often met with individuals who welcomed him as their former physician and benefactor.

It appears from Dr. Grant's journal and from his map, that the mountainous tract in the centre of which the Nestorians dwell, is (roughly speaking) nearly quadrangular, and nearly at equal distances from the lakes of Van and Ooroomiah and from the Tigris. The highest mountains apparently are in the E. and N. E. They are the sources of the streams flowing to the Tigris; while those descending to the eastern lake are much shorter. To the Tigris run two main streams, cleaving the high mountain region to its base, and finding their way along the

bottoms of the deep chasms thus formed. The chief of these is the Zab (Zabatus of Xenophon), which with its similar lateral vallies and streams drains all that part of the country seen by Dr. Grant. Parallel to this, though with a shorter course, and rising N. W. of Julamerk, is the Khabâr, perhaps the Habor of the Hebrews, which flows S. W. in a shorter course to join the Tigris below Jezirah. To Dr. Grant we owe the first correct account of this latter stream, which is wrongly laid down on all former maps.

The summits of these mountains, or rather of this mountainous region, it would seem, furnish a species of table land, on which much pasture grows in summer. These high pastures are called *Zozan*. The villages and dwellings of the inhabitants are all in the vallies and near the streams, and are built of stone; but in summer they drive their flocks to the *Zozan* above, and dwell there for the season in tents; not very unlike the peasants of Switzerland. The Nestorians of these fastnesses everywhere appear like other independent mountaineers, rude, fierce and indomitable, yet kind-hearted and hospitable, with many peculiar virtues and customs, arising out of their seclusion from the world and the pressure of foes from without. We have been greatly struck, while reading Dr. Grant's account, with their close resemblance to other Christian tribes in like circumstances; particularly the Mainotes of Greece and the Montenegrins of the Illyrian coast. Some of these coincidences we shall have occasion hereafter to refer to.

For this portion of his book the public are very greatly indebted to Dr. Grant; and had he broken off here, he would have heard only the voice of universal thanks. But he has chosen to devote the remaining two-thirds of his work to bringing forward a theory, which, as he has treated it, bears very much the aspect of a *hobby*, viz. that these Nestorian tribes are the descendants and representatives of the lost ten tribes of Israel. His arguments in support of this theory are partly historical and circumstantial, and partly prophetic. These latter we are willing to let go for what they are worth, without taking them ourselves at all into the account; being fully of opinion in respect to prophecies *yet to be fulfilled* (on which the argument is built), that we at this day know very more, than did of old the prophets who inquired and asked diligently, and the angels who desired to look into; in either case without success. Nothing is more easy

than to make out any theory of the future, and find the proof of it in prophecy. Witness the many theories of the present day, respecting the prospects and destiny of the Jews.

As to the other arguments adduced by Dr. Grant, we regard the main strength of his position as resting upon these two, viz., the tradition prevalent among the Nestorians themselves and admitted by the resident Jews; and the probability that their country is one of the places to which the ten tribes were carried away. These, we admit, if the reports made are entirely correct and not over-colored, are important facts; and as such we shall hereafter give them a more particular examination. Besides these, however, Dr. Grant has thrown together a mass of what he probably would regard as cumulative evidence, drawn from the consideration of their language, their names, their reputed observance of parts of the Mosaic ritual, such as sacrifices, vows, and the like; their physiognomy and proper names; their tribes and government; their custom of blood-revenge; their social and domestic habits, hospitality, marriage rites, and general occupations. All these are brought forward with great confidence, as being identical with, and derived from, the similar characteristics and customs of the Hebrews; and as therefore affording decisive proof that the people in question are of the race of Israel. But in the exhibition of all this evidence, we regret to perceive too often the air rather of a special pleader, than of the accurate historian and sound critic.

Thus, then, we have here another added to the multitude of theories, according to which, in turn, the ten tribes of Israel have been lost and found throughout all the northern half of the globe,—in every country of Europe, Asia and North America. Is the new theory better than the old? Since the publication of Dr. Grant's book, we have heard the remark made in various parts of the country, that admitting all its statements to be true and well founded, he would appear to have established his position. For this reason, it seems to be a duty towards the Christian public, to examine somewhat closely the evidence adduced, in order to judge both of its intrinsic value and of its bearing on the point in question.

Of the previous theories, that which recognizes the lost tribes of Israel in the aborigines of North America, is perhaps at the present day the most popular. It has been sustained with a good deal of acuteness and much zeal by Dr. Boudinot, Ethan

Smith and M. M. Noah ; and to it, after their example, Mr. Silk Buckingham has recently given in his adhesion. As a refutation of this theory, Dr. Grant thinks it sufficient to remark as follows, p. 135 : " The evidence which has been adduced to identify the American Indians with the lost tribes is entirely circumstantial, and based chiefly upon customs, etc., which are *primitive* rather than peculiarly Jewish ; customs similar to those found among the Arabs and other eastern nations." We ask the reader to bear this remark in mind.

It would lead us too far to follow out in detail all the minor points of evidence adduced by the author ; nor is this essential. If we can succeed in showing the true character and force of the more important portions of his argument, the reader will then be in a situation duly to appreciate the remainder. Nor do we think it necessary to follow the precise order of the book ; but shall reserve the consideration of their language, their traditions, and their country, till the last.

We begin with Chap. VI. From the *names* applied by the Nestorians to themselves, Dr. Grant derives an argument for their Hebrew descent. Now, so far as they are called *Syrians*, *Chaldeans*, or *Nestorians*, we know the origin of these names, and that they have in themselves no bearing on the point at issue. The term *Beni Israel*, by which they are further said to call themselves, is obviously connected with the tradition of their descent, which will be considered afterwards. But the name *Nazareans*, which is likewise very commonly employed by themselves and others, Dr. Grant thinks, may be, " as evidence of their Hebrew descent, in some respects even more satisfactory than the expressive appellation, Sons of Israel." This appears, as he supposes, from the fact, that this term was originally applied to " Christians converted from *Judaism* ;" in other words, all Nazareans were at first " Jews, or Israelites converted to Christianity." He cites the remark of Mosheim, that " those who have the title of Christians among the Greeks, were among the Jews called Nazareans ;" and after an argument of some length, sums up his conclusion thus : " It is quite clear, that the Nazareans were converted Jews ; and the Nestorians, being Nazareans, must be converted Jews." p. 198.

Now on all this it is sufficient to make two remarks. First, because the name Nazareans may, in its origin, have had this limited signification, it does not follow that it must retain the same now, after the lapse of nearly eighteen centuries. And

further, Dr. Grant appears to have overlooked the fact, or perhaps was not aware of it, that in the wide-spread Arabic language this same term Nazareans is the only current name for Christians. From the western coasts of Africa to the eastern shores of Arabia Felix; from the Mediterranean to the mountains of Kurdistan; wherever an Arab has occasion to speak of Christians, he knows them solely as Nazareans.* Now the great body of the Chaldeans (papal Nestorians) on the west of the mountains speak the Arabic wholly or occasionally; and we therefore need not go back to antiquity to account for its introduction or its meaning among the Nestorians. They have adopted it, just as they have adopted their title for Dr. Grant himself, *Hakîm*,† from the Arabic.

In Chap. VII, several things are brought forward in regard to the rites and customs of the Nestorians, which the author refers directly to an hereditary observance of the Mosaic ritual. Among these are *sacrifices*; which, in the form of "peace-offerings," are found among this people. "They are usually offered to return thanks for God's benefits, or to obtain new favors from him; as, for instance, the recovery of sick friends, or their own restoration to health. The animal is then usually slain before the door of the church, when a little of the blood is often put upon the door or lintels." p. 207. The flesh is then usually eaten. But Dr. Grant admits, that "sacrifices are common also among heathen nations, and are practised by the Muhammedans, and even by the Armenians." As to the Muhammedans, similar offerings are frequent among them. The writer was once present, when his Bedawîn guides offered such a sacrifice in the midst of the desert between Sinai and Palestine.

* Sing. *Nusrâny*; Plur. *Nûsâra* and *Nûsârah*. See Freytag's Lex. Arab. IV. pp. 287, 288. In Acts 11: 26, the Arabic version has for Christians a word derived from *Messiah*, much as if we should speak of *Messianites*. But this is very unusual. The Syriac in the same passage adopts the Greek word *Χριστιανοί*.—Mr. Smith remarks, that in using the term *Nûsrâny*, the Nestorians "seemed to feel that it is a generic term, and sometimes added *Siriâny* to make it distinctive of their sect; which was equivalent to calling themselves *Syrian Christians*." Researches, Vol. II. pp. 214, 215.

† In the letters of the Patriarch, etc. Zeitschr. für die Kunde des Morgenl. III. p. 222. *Hakîm* signifies properly "a wise man;" but is in common use for "physician, doctor."

A kid was killed as a "redemption," in order that its death might redeem their camels from death; and also as a peace-offering for the prosperity of our journey. With the blood they smeared crosses on the necks of their camels, and on other parts of their bodies.* But how then are we to know, that the sacrifices of the Nestorians are so "peculiarly Jewish,"† as to prove that people to be of Hebrew origin, and not also to prove the same of the Muhammedans and Armenians? To this Dr. Grant replies, that "in all these (latter) cases, no proof can be furnished from the attendant circumstances, or the people themselves, by which either they or their sacrifices can be traced to a Hebrew origin." p. 210. It is only in connection with other evidence of the Hebrew descent of the Nestorians, that these sacrifices "afford the strong proof of their Israelitish origin." This we must regard as verging closely upon that species of logic sometimes called "begging the question." The argument drawn out, is as follows:

The Nestorians are of Hebrew descent.	The Armenians are <i>not</i> of Hebrew descent.
They have sacrifices.	They have sacrifices. But
Therefore: Their sacrifices are of Hebrew origin, and prove them to be of Hebrew descent.	Therefore: Their sacrifices are not of Hebrew origin, and prove nothing.

The occurrence of *vows* among the Nestorians is adduced by Dr. Grant as going to prove also their Hebrew descent. Strangely enough he brings this topic forward, as if vows among Christians were peculiar to the Nestorians; without the slightest allusion to the very extensive prevalence of vows of various kinds, not only among the Greeks and Romans, as well as the primitive Christians, but also throughout the most of modern Christendom and the Muhammedan world. Yet the temples of the Christian and the mosks of the Muslim to this day everywhere

* Biblical Researches in Palestine, etc. I. p. 269. See also Lane's Modern Egyptians, I. pp. 58, 110, 111, 306. II. pp. 251, 293, 303. The Coptic Christians have also sacrifices at their marriages and at the tombs of their relatives; Lane, *ibid.* II. pp. 331, 335.

† See also the account given by the Nestorians themselves of their sacrifices to Smith and Dwight; where they are represented merely as "a good work." Researches II. p. 216.

exhibit votive offerings ; besides the multitudes of vows made and fulfilled in private, that have left no trace behind.*

The *first-fruits* of the fields, gardens, vineyards, and flocks, according to Dr. Grant, are to this day presented to the Lord by the independent Nestorians, as they were among the Jews of old. p. 213. They are carried to the principal church, and are consumed by attendants and visitors at the church, or in public festivals. Such was indeed the ancient Hebrew custom. But so obvious is the idea of such an offering of gratitude, that among nearly all nations who had, or have, an established system of sacrifices, the offering of the first-fruits has rarely been omitted ; so that the custom may be regarded as one of the very earliest institutes of worship. It prevailed among the Greeks, Romans, and Egyptians ;† and at the present day, we have little doubt, that traces of a similar custom may be discovered among other oriental Christians. At any rate, the custom has been found prevailing among the American Indians to such an extent, as to form one of the principal arguments of those who advocate the descent of the latter from the ten tribes. “ Their most solemn worship was the sacrifice of the first-fruits, in which they burnt the first and fattest buck, and feasted together on what else they had collected.”‡ Among the tribes north of the Ohio, twelve old men were selected, who held up the venison and the first-fruits (of corn), and prayed with their faces to the east ; after which the offering was eaten.§ This indeed is one of the instances which Dr. Grant pronounces to be “ *primitive* rather than peculiarly Jewish ;” but what is there in the first-fruits of

* Dr. Grant relates the instance of a priest, who was trying to lead a very holy life, and had therefore taken the vow of a Nazarite, letting his hair and beard grow, and eating no meat nor milk nor oil. pp. 92, 212. Such instances are said to be uncommon ; and are obviously nothing more nor less than the ascetic vows so frequent in the history and practice of all the churches. There is nothing more Jewish in the one case, than in the other.

† See the References in Winer Bibl. Realw. I. p. 404. Compare Spencer Legg. Ritt. p. 716.

‡ Smith's Hist. of New Jersey. See also the testimony of William Penn, Adair, and others, collected by Boudinot, Star in the West, pp. 209—229.

§ Beatty, quoted by Boudinot, ib. p. 211.

the Nestorians, taken by themselves, which show that they are any less "primitive" and general?

It is a beautiful and striking trait in the character of the Nestorians, that the *Christian Sabbath* is regarded with a sacredness among the mountain tribes, unusual among the other Christians of the East. On the plains there is much desecration of the Lord's day. p. 214. This strict observance, Dr. Grant argues, is a remnant of Judaism; and hence, they are of Hebrew origin. May it not rather be a result of their secluded position in the mountains, which has shut them out from the adverse influences that have operated on their brethren in the plains? Was the strictness with which the Puritans of New England once kept the Sabbath, in any way connected with a Hebrew lineage? Further, the severity of the Jewish observances had and has reference to the rest of the seventh day; and although the primitive Gentile churches adopted only the first day, yet among a church of purely Jewish converts, we should naturally look for some slight trace of regard for their former Sabbath, the seventh day. Yet nothing of this appears among the Nestorians.

In a similar manner, the author finds a parallel between the sanctuary or chancel in the Nestorian churches, and that of the Jewish temple; and this to him is an evidence of Jewish descent. But we are not sure that these sanctuaries or chancels in the churches of this people, are any more sacred than those in the churches of other oriental Christians, and especially those of the Copts.*

The Nestorian women after childbirth are not allowed to enter the church, until the expiration of *forty* days; and in some places, the term is prolonged to sixty days, if the child be a female. In respect to this custom, we recognize, with Dr. Grant, its Jewish origin, in the ceremony of purification; but we do not see that it proves the Hebrew descent of the people. It is nothing more nor less than the very current custom of the *churching* of women, which prevails throughout all churches, and in the Greek church is also fixed at forty days; while in the West, no certain time is appointed. Even the English liturgy contains an office for the same occasion.

* Lane's Mod. Egypt, II. p. 321. Into the Coptic *Heykel*, the sanctuary or chancel around the altar, only the officiating priests are admitted.

“*Swine’s flesh* and the meats prohibited by the Levitical code, are regarded by many of the Nestorians with little less abhorrence, than they were by the Jews. In the mountains, though wild hogs are frequently killed, very few, if any, eat of their flesh.” p. 219. Some of the Nestorians, then, do eat of wild swine. So too, in Egypt, according to Mr. Lane,* “the Copts almost universally abstain from eating swine’s flesh ;” but the flesh of the wild boar is often eaten by them. Camel’s flesh, too, they consider unlawful, as did the Jews. But because of their abstinence from swine’s and camel’s flesh, we are not aware, that the Copts have ever been regarded as descendants of the Jews.

In the *fasts and festivals* of the Nestorians, including the *Passover*, there is said to be a close analogy to those of the ancient Jews. p. 220. But beyond all question, this is in like manner literally true of all the oriental churches. In the *Passover*, Dr. G. says, the Nestorians substitute the emblems of Christ’s body and blood for the paschal lamb ; in other respects they keep the festival (according to Dr. G.) much after the manner of the ancient Hebrews. But what is this manner ? and do not all Christian churches make the like substitution ? So long as we have no more definite information, we must doubt, whether the Easter of the Nestorians differs greatly from that of the other churches of the East.

In respect to two great leading customs of the Jews, which of all others we should expect to find retained among a church composed of converts from Judaism, *and still claiming to be such*, the Nestorians not only do not possess these customs themselves, but in neglecting them have departed from the practice of other Christian churches. The first is *tithes*, of which there is no trace among that people (p. 214), although so current among other Christian nations. The other is *circumcision*, which is not practised. p. 221. It is not enough to say that this rite was abolished in the apostolic church. The apostolic decree had reference only to the Gentiles and not to the Jewish converts ; and even Paul himself at a later period circumcised Timothy. The Jewish converts were in the highest degree tenacious of this rite ; and their obstinacy was the occasion of all the difficulty in the primitive church. It is therefore very singular, that in a nation of Christians descended solely from

* Vol. II. p. 326.

Jewish converts, there should be not a trace of this rite; and the more so, because throughout the Muhammedan world around them, and also among the Coptic Christians,* circumcision is still practised. In these facts, as it seems to me, lies a very strong point of counter-evidence against the validity of Dr. Grant's whole theory.

We now come to Chap. VIII, in which the author endeavors to sustain the same position, by an appeal to the physiognomy of the Nestorians, their proper names, their tribes and government, and the practice of blood-revenge. In regard to the many Jewish *proper names* in use among the people, this no more proves them to be descendants of the ten tribes, than the prevalence of the same names among the Maronites, or also among the Puritans of England and New England, makes them out also to be of Hebrew lineage. Dr. Grant relates, that of forty-five members of their seminary, thirty-two had Jewish names found in the Bible. We have looked at the first twelve classes on the general catalogue of Yale College, from A. D. 1702 to 1713 inclusive, containing in all forty-six graduates; and find that of these not less than forty-four had Jewish names found in the Bible; and a like proportion continues for many years afterwards.—We will take up the other points in their order.

“The *physiognomy* of the Nestorian Christians bears a close resemblance to that of the Jews of the country in which they dwell” (p. 223), so much so that it is often difficult to distinguish between them. Dr. Grant adduces also the testimony of one English and one American gentleman, as remarking their “peculiar Jewish physiognomy.” But it is not said, whether this remark was made before or after these gentlemen were aware of Dr. Grant's hypothesis. On the other hand, Messrs. Smith and Dwight, who were for some time in the region of Ooroomiah, and who certainly were not careless observers, make no mention of any such resemblance to the Jews, although they heard them claim to be of Jewish descent. Mr. Rich, too, who gives a drawing of a Nestorian family from the mountains, is in like manner silent as to the same point; and Mr. Perkins, the oldest member of the mission, in describing the Nestorians as a “very fine looking people,” with “features regular, manly, intelligent and often handsome,” yet says nothing of any Jew-

* Lane's Mod. Egypt. II. p. 326.

ish expression.* From the silence of such observers, we might perhaps draw the conclusion, that there is probably no very prominent national resemblance, whatever there may be in individual cases.

But in regard to this question of Jewish physiognomy in general, it may be well to bear in mind the very judicious observation of Mr. Lane, that "in features, and in the general expression of countenance, the oriental Jews differ less from other eastern nations, than do those in European countries from the people among whom they live."† That is to say, the Jews are essentially an oriental people; and when transplanted to a European soil, and scattered among nations of the Teutonic or other western races, their oriental physiognomy at once marks them out as a distinct people. But in the East, surrounded by other oriental races of not dissimilar features, the distinction which stands forth so prominently in the West falls away; and to the eyes of a Frank traveller the general expression of all oriental features assumes everywhere the air of a Jewish physiognomy. We may thus perhaps account in part for the fact, that such a resemblance has been ascribed to various tribes, and in some cases contradicted by other travellers. Thus in the case of the Afghans, Forster was forcibly struck with their Jewish physiognomy; which Wolf again directly denies. Major Rawlinson supposes that the Kalhurs around Mount Zagros may be descendants of the ten tribes; "they have many Jewish names among them, and above all their general physiognomy is strongly indicative of Jewish descent."‡ Of the Lesghy tribes, a bigoted Muslim race of wild savage banditti, inhabiting the mountains in the south of Dhagistan west of the Caspian, Mr. Samuel affirms that "their physiognomy and character assimilate in many respects to the Hebrew family. They appear to be of the same [Hebrew] stock, and descended from one common parent, as far as outward appearance goes."§ And not only is this general likeness of feature found among the Asiatic tribes; but those of North America are also made to

* Smith and Dwight's Researches, Vol. II. p. 242. Rich's Koordistan, Vol. II. Mr. Perkins in Am. Bib. Repos. Jan. 1841, p. 16.

† Mod. Egypt, II. p. 343.

‡ Jour. of Lond. Geogr. Soc. Vol. IX. p. 36.

§ Samuel's Remnant Found, pp. 46, 47.

bear the same common Jewish stamp. No testimony can be stronger than that of William Penn, who thus writes to a friend in England: "I found them with like countenances with the Hebrew race; and their children of so lively a resemblance to them, that a man would think himself in Duke's Place or Barry Street in London, when he sees them." Mr. Catlin, himself a painter, bears witness in a manner no less explicit: "The first thing that strikes the traveller in an Indian country, as evidence of the Indians being of Jewish origin, is the close resemblance which they generally bear, in a certain expression of countenance, to those people."*

All this may suffice to show, first, how very uncertain all such testimony is in itself; and secondly, how easily the eye and judgment may be unconsciously influenced by a desire to support a favorite theory.

The Nestorians are divided into *tribes*, inhabiting different portions or vallies of the country; and at the head of each of these tribes, and of their subdivisions, are found chiefs bearing the title of *Melek*. The head of the whole nation is in fact the Patriarch; who however is clothed strictly only with spiritual power, and has no army or force at his command, except as he may have influence enough, on an emergency, to call one or more of the *Meleks* to his aid.† In all this Dr. G. finds of course the tribes of Israel,‡ the name *Melek* which designated the royal head of the Hebrew nation, and the high priest of the Hebrew commonwealth. But it is difficult to see, how these tribes of the Nestorians and their *Meleks*, have *per se* any thing more to do with the Jews, than the tribes of Mount Sinai and their *Sheikhs*, or than any other of the thousand Bedawin tribes which roam over the eastern deserts. The term *Melek* is here obviously only equivalent to *Sheikh*; and is so used likewise in Arabic in the countries on the upper Nile as far as Darfour and Sennaar, being common (in the abbreviated form *Mek*) to all the petty chieftains of those regions.‡

* Buckingham's America, I. p. 92.

† Smith and Dwight, Researches, II. p. 218.

‡ "The existence of the Nestorians, from time immemorial, in distinct tribes, nearly or quite corresponding in number to those of ancient Israel, is a remarkable fact, and may furnish interesting testimony with regard to their origin." p. 225.

§ Burckhardt's Travels in Nubia, etc. p. 211.

Nor is it necessary to refer the supreme authority of the Patriarch to the example of the Jewish high priest.

We have already alluded to the small mountainous region of Montenegro, near the Illyrian coast, and its hardy and warlike race of Slavic mountaineers, as presenting in many respects a striking parallel to the country and people of the independent Nestorians. The inhabitants are divided into four *Nahia* or districts; and these again into tribes; and each *Nahia* and tribe has over it a chief. But the most singular part is, that "the highest person among the Montenegrins, is the Metropolitan or Bishop, called in their language *Vladika*." This species of theocracy grew up in Montenegro, about three centuries ago; and the office of *Vladika* is now hereditary in a particular family, in such a way, however, that the incumbent has the right of designating which member of the family shall be his successor.* This seems also to be the case with the Patriarch of the Nestorians; who, in other respects, has about him nothing more of the Jewish high priest than has the *Vladika* of Montenegro.

A very early custom of the Hebrews and of other ancient nations, was that of *blood-revenge*; by which, in all cases of homicide, the nearest relative of the person slain was bound to kill the slayer, or be himself regarded infamous. So deeply was this custom seated, that even Moses did not see fit to prohibit it directly; but chose rather to evade and counteract the evil by the institution of cities of refuge. The same custom we find still existing among the tribes of the independent Nestorians in its full strength; so that "an indelible stain marks the character of the person who does not avenge the death of a relative." p. 229. Dr. G. confirms the statement by terrible examples. p. 91. While two promising lads, the sons of two brothers, were at play together, one shot the other; and the be-

* Wuk Stephanowitch, *Montenegro und die Montenegriner*, Stuttg. u. Tüb. 1837, pp. 30, 31.—In 1838, the present king of Saxony visited Montenegro, and was very hospitably received by the *Vladika*. After his return, the latter sent him a complimentary poem of his own composition; and as there happened to be at the time no scholar in Dresden acquainted with the language, the poem was put into the hands of a lady, now a resident in this country, to translate. The present *Vladika* is a young man, partly educated at St. Petersburg.

reaved father, who was the legal avenger of blood, could accept of nothing but the blood of his brother's child. In a social party, a person, for some supposed insult, plunged his dagger into the breast of another; upon which the brother of the slain closed the scene, by laying the murderer dead at his feet. And this, too, among a Christian people! To Dr. G. this custom affords of course indubitable evidence in behalf of his favorite position.

But what evidence have we, that this custom continued to exist among the later Jews; or that it was even found at all among them after the separation of the kingdoms of Judah and Israel? We know of none. The institution of cities of refuge under Joshua appears to have done its work, and accomplished the object of the great legislator, by gradually wearing out this hideous feature. Even under the Judges, the rights of the *Goel* or avenger, the next of kin, (to judge from the Book of Ruth,) appear to have become limited to the *Levirate* duties and the privilege of redeeming property. The latest trace of blood-revenge furnished by the Scriptures, is in the feigned story of the woman of Tekoah, intended to persuade David to recall Absalom; although in respect to Absalom himself, it is not intimated that he was exposed to danger from this custom.* From that time forward, there is no farther hint of the practice among the Hebrews; the Jews of the age of the New Testament had it not; nor is it found among the Jews of the present day in any quarter of the globe. How then could the Nestorians derive it from the Jews? It was and is unknown to the latter; and it is totally at variance with all the precepts of Christianity. Instead, therefore, of proving any kindred between the Nestorians and Jews, this fact, so far as it goes, tends rather to establish the contrary.

The same fact serves to show, that this is more probably one of those *primitive* and universal customs, which spring up among different races under the influence of similar circumstances. To say nothing of the ancient Greeks and Arabians, as well as the modern Persians, Abyssinians, Druses, and Circassians, among whom this atrocious feature is related to exist, more or less,† we meet with it at the present day prevailing especially among independent nomadic or pastoral tribes, where the want or

* 2 Sam. c. xiv.

† See the authorities in Winer *Bibl. Realw.* I. p. 221.

weakness of an established civil government, renders the public administration of criminal justice imperfect or impracticable. Thus we still find the custom in its full strength among the wild hordes of Bedawin who rove over the Arabian deserts and nestle in Mount Sinai; among all of whom, it has never been counteracted by the institution of cities of refuge nor by any other asylum.* Still more remarkable is it, that the same customs should still be found existing among rude Christian tribes inhabiting mountainous districts; like the Nestorians of Kurdistan, the Mainotes of the Peloponnesus,† and the Montenegrins of Illyria. In this latter country, the custom of blood-revenge is carried even to a greater extent than among the Nestorians. "It is considered a sacred duty; and such a debt *must* be paid, even if not until after a hundred years. If, of two brothers, one were to slay their father, the other would be bound to avenge the father's death by the blood of his own brother. The relatives of the slain preserve his bloody garments, in order to stimulate by the sight their friends to vengeance; and especially is this done by the mother of the young children of a murdered person, in order to inculcate the same lesson as they grow up."‡ The custom here, as well as among the Nestorians, obviously takes the place of public judicial punishment.

A parallel to the Hebrew *cities of refuge* is found by Dr. Grant in the Nestorian churches; to which the man-slayer may flee and remain in security, until he shall have been proved to be guilty, or his case have been adjusted by payment of the fine of blood, or otherwise. Among the Bedawin, where no churches exist, the slayer flies to another tribe; among the Mainotes and Montenegrins, he does the same, or he may make the church his sanctuary. But Dr. G. leaves entirely out of view the fact, that even the ancient heathen temples were in the same manner asylums, like that of Diana at Ephesus;§ and also that in an early age the like immunities were granted by the emperors to all Christian churches, and convents, and

* Bibl. Researches in Palest. I. p. 209. Burckhardt, Travels in Syria, etc. p. 540.

† See a horrible instance which occurred in Maina, even between priests, in Col. Leake's Travels in the Morea, I. pp. 236, 237.

‡ Wuk Steph. Montenegro u. die Montenegriner, p. 35.

§ See the references, Winer Bibl. Realw. I. pp. 443, 444.

were extended even to church-yards and bishops' houses; whence the criminal could not be removed without a legal assurance of life, and an entire remission of the crime. The same immunity still exists in the churches of some Catholic countries. In all this, there is just as much relation to the Hebrew cities of refuge, as there is in the Nestorian churches; and the one instance proves just as much as the other, and no more.

[To be concluded.*]

ARTICLE X.

CRITICAL NOTICES.

- 1.—*Sermons on Important Subjects. By the Rev. Samuel Davies. A. M., Pres. of the College of New Jersey. With an Essay on the Life and Times of the Author; by Albert Barnes. Stereotype edition, containing all the Author's Sermons ever published. In three volumes. New York: Dayton & Saxton. 1841. pp. 566, 556, 499.*

PRESIDENT DAVIES has always stood in the front rank of American preachers. Although called to the sacred office without the advantages of a thorough education, and dying at an early age, he attained to distinguished celebrity as a pulpit orator. His published sermons are mostly posthumous; still if we imagine them to have been "delivered," in the language of Mr. Barnes, "by a man of the noble bearing, the fine form, the eloquent gesticulation, the fervor of manner, and the *heart* and *soul* of such a man as Mr. Davies, it is easy to understand the reason why he had so commanding an influence over a popular audience, and why he was characterized as the prince of preachers." His rich natural endowments, however, did not betray him into the fault of negligent and hasty preparation for the pulpit. "I always thought it," he once remarked, "to be a most awful thing to go into the pulpit and there speak nonsense in the name of God. Besides, when I have an opportunity of preparing, and neglect to do

* We regret that want of space obliges us to defer the remainder of this article till the next number.

so, I am afraid to look up to God for assistance, for that would be to ask him to countenance my negligence." "Every discourse of his, which he thought worthy of the name of a sermon, cost him four days' hard study."

The productions of such a man, written with such views of the sacredness of his work, could not fail to be acceptable and useful. It will not be expected of us to point out the characteristics of Pres. Davies as a sermonizer. Mr. Barnes has done this with discrimination and fidelity in his "Essay on the Life and Times of the Author." But the best voucher for the value of these discourses is their almost unexampled popularity. Probably no other sermons which have issued from the American press have obtained more unequivocal proofs of the public favor. Prior to 1800, nine editions of them had been given to the world. In Great Britain, moreover, they have been repeatedly published with the approval and recommendations of the soundest divines. The publishers of the volumes before us have acted wisely for themselves, we have no doubt, as well as advantageously for the public in preparing this "stereotype edition."

The preliminary "essay," above referred to, occupies about 60 pages. It takes a rapid view of the leading incidents in the life of Pres. Davies, and also of the early history of Presbyterianism in Virginia, the materials of which were mainly furnished by Dr. Hill. Next follows the writer's estimate of Pres. Davies as a preacher. The last 25 pages of the "essay" are devoted to a consideration of "*the kind of ministry fitted to the times in which we live.*" The sentiments advanced in the progress of this discussion are judicious and weighty,—such as we should expect from one who himself illustrates "the kind of preaching that this age demands." The sermons contained in the present edition are eighty-two in number, embracing a great variety of subjects,—ordinary and occasional,—and well suited to all classes of readers.

2.—*A Grammar of the New Testament Dialect.* By M. Stuart, Prof. of Sacred Literature in the Theol. Seminary at Andover. Second edition, corrected and mostly written anew. Andover: Allen, Morrill & Wardwell (successors to Gould and Newman). New York: Dayton & Saxton. 1841. pp. 308.

The first edition of this grammar,—which was published in 1834,—having been for some time exhausted, Prof. Stuart has reluctantly consented to issue a second. The state of his

health, in connection with the multiplicity of his engagements, deterred him at first from assuming any additional labor ; but having once consented to revise his previous investigations, he has applied himself to the undertaking with characteristic diligence and fidelity. The science of Greek grammar has been rapidly advancing during the last few years. The work of Kühner,—to omit the mention of others,—has thrown floods of light upon the structure of this venerable language. “Buttmann and Hermann,” Prof. Stuart observes in his Preface, “laid the foundation for recent improvements; Kühner has shown to what an extent they have been carried. The science of grammar has been simplified, and *principle* is now substituted, in a multitude of cases, for what had before been little better than a chaotic mass of facts. It would seem that not much further room is left for any important improvements; yet the history of the past may well admonish us, not to exclude the hope of still further acquisitions to grammatical science.”

The most cursory perusal of the volume before us is sufficient to prove that Prof. Stewart has not been inattentive to the recent discoveries. The present edition is considerably larger than the first. Important parts of the work have been “written entirely anew,” and it may be regarded as bringing together all the great principles of the language. The “Verbs” are treated with fulness and accuracy; and more than 150 pages are devoted to “Syntax.” Some topics, which have been too much neglected in this country, here receive the attention which their importance demands.

3.—*Notes, Critical and Practical, on the Book of Exodus; designed as a general help to Biblical Reading and Instruction. By George Bush, Prof. of Heb. and Orient. Lit., N. Y. City University. In two volumes. Andover: Gould & Newman. New-York: Dayton & Saxton. 1841. pp. 300, 299.*

Prof. Bush is already known as a learned and industrious commentator on the Old Testament. These volumes have the same general characteristics as the *Notes on Genesis*. They bear the mark of uncommon diligence, extensive research, and a commendable readiness to meet the real difficulties of the sacred text. His language is clear, sometimes a little too copious perhaps, but always carefully weighed and chosen. He is distinguished above most modern interpreters of Scripture by the strength of his imagination; indeed he constantly

reminds us of some of the older commentators. This peculiarity imparts a freshness to many passages in his expositions which heighten the pleasure with which they are perused. Occasionally, however, it leads him to interpretations and opinions which, to say the least, are somewhat questionable. Types and symbols assume an importance and a significance, in his hands, which few assign to them at the present day.

In most of Prof. Bush's expositions we fully concur; he usually exhibits the true spirit of the original. In cases of real difficulty he lays out his strength, and generally with success. He denies,—with good reason we think,—that the magicians of Pharaoh performed genuine miracles; they merely imitated, by their *enchancements*, the prodigies of Moses and Aaron. God hardened the heart of Pharaoh, he supposes, not by any positive divine influence, but by so ordering the course of events that “the haughty king should take occasion to *confirm himself* in his disregard of the counsels of the Most High.”

We regret that he has refused to locate the passage of the Israelites across the Red Sea in the immediate vicinity of Suez. In opposition to the opinions of Niebuhr, Leclerc, Rosenmüller, Dr. Robinson and others, he adopts the theory of the editor of the Pictorial Bible and those who agree with him, which places this occurrence “some ten or twelve miles farther south.” The arguments which he adduces in support of this preference seem to us unsatisfactory,—especially the consideration “that the waters being here deeper and broader the miracle would be the more conspicuous and unquestionable.” We think too that Prof. Bush has found himself somewhat straitened in his interpretation of certain expressions in the context. He supposes, for instance, “that the body of the waters had been rolled up, as it were, by the force of the wind from the *western* to the *eastern* side of the sea, and that it was through this agglomerated fluid that the passage was opened.” Of course this could not have been the effect of an *east wind*; and hence he gives to קָדִים “rather a generic than a specific import,” denoting “any *uncommonly strong or violent wind* from whatever quarter it blows.” Besides, we conceive it to have been absolutely impossible for six hundred thousand men, with their women and children, “the mixed multitude” that followed them, and “their flocks and herds, even very much cattle,” to have crossed the Red Sea ten or twelve miles south of Suez, during the time allowed them by the sacred narrative.

The remarks of Prof. Bush respecting the *shechinah*, the *tabernacle* and the *cherubim*, will excite the most attention. He has evidently bestowed much thought upon each of these

topics ; and those who dissent from his opinions must admire the sincerity and earnestness with which he holds and defends them. We have not space for a careful examination of our author's sentiments ; and nothing short of an extended notice can do them justice. We commend them to the diligent study of all lovers of biblical investigation.

The value of the second volume is materially enhanced by numerous cuts, illustrative of the tabernacle, its furniture, the dresses of the priests, etc.

4.—*Autobiography, Reminiscences and Letters of John Trumbull, from 1756 to 1841.* New-York and London: Wiley & Putnam. New-Haven: B. L. Hamlen. 1841. pp. 439.

We are in every respect gratified with the appearance of this handsomely executed octavo volume from the pen of the octogenarian Colonel Trumbull. On opening it we are presented with an accurate engraved likeness of the venerable author and subject of the work, taken in 1833. This is as it should be. When an old man, on the eve of his departure to a better world, pauses to perform that work which most persons, necessarily as well as properly, leave to their survivors, there is a propriety in his presenting his face with the record of his life. And such a man has a right to tell his own story. That which would be justly censured as egotism and vanity, in a younger man, may be received with satisfaction from one who has survived two generations of the world's inhabitants, and whose life has been prolonged almost to the limits of a third. Such an one, having well nigh finished his course, having done with the world and its objects of ambition, can leave no richer legacy to posterity than a faithful record of his own life and times. He is the relic of a by-gone age ; and if, as we believe is true of Col. Trumbull, his mind is uncorrupted, and retains, in a great degree, its original vigor, it is a blessing to mankind for him to linger among the living. When he testifies of what he has seen and heard, his writings come upon us with something of that authority with which memory repeats to us the counsels of a venerated father who, being dead, yet speaketh ; and they are the more interesting, because they are the words of a living witness.

Col. Trumbull was the son of John Trumbull, Governor of Connecticut, and was born at Lebanon in that state, 1756. Being in his infancy the subject of "convulsion fits," his life was preserved by a remarkable providence and the untiring care of his mother. His education was conducted with the best

advantages of those times. His taste for drawing and painting was early indicated. He was graduated at Cambridge at the age of seventeen, and soon after, by the approach of the revolution, had his attention directed to the study of military affairs. At the age of nineteen he entered the army as adjutant, was in the battle of Bunker's Hill, was soon after appointed Aid to General Washington, and then advanced to the rank of Major, and soon after to that of Colonel, and was present at some of the most interesting scenes of the war, until 1777, when, before he had reached the age of twenty-one years, he closed his military career, by declining to receive his commission as Colonel, on account of the refusal of Congress to give it the date to which he judged it entitled. The correspondence relating to this unhappy occurrence is spread before the reader, and is honorable to the military spirit of the youthful aspirant.

He then resumed his favorite study of painting as a profession, and went to Boston for this purpose; and, after some interruption by the progress of the war, he went to Europe at the age of twenty-four and became a pupil of Mr. West in London. Here, after a few months, he was arrested and retained in prison for the term of seven months under suspicion of unfriendly designs against the British government. After his release he sailed to Holland, and thence, through much danger and delay, to America, where he remained until peace was restored between the two countries, when he returned to London in 1784, and commenced his famous picture of the Battle of Bunker's Hill and other works in the line of his profession, visited France and other countries, and remained abroad until 1789, when he returned. In 1794, he again embarked for England, as Secretary to Mr. Jay, and, in 1796, was appointed one of the commissioners to carry into execution the seventh article of the treaty between the two governments, remained abroad several years, visited France and was exposed to the peril of his life by the spirit of the French Revolution, returned to New-York, again visited England in 1808, and remained abroad eight years, since which he has honored his own country with his residence and a reputation in the line of his profession which is surpassed by no American artist. His paintings in the rotunda at Washington and in the Trumbull gallery at New-Haven will remain as monuments of his genius; and it is gratifying to reflect that a life of so much vicissitude, so useful and honorable to our country, is still prolonged and comfortably provided for by an annuity from Yale College in return for the splendid works which adorn the Trumbull gallery.

We have then in this volume the *Reminiscences* of one who lived before the great American Revolution, who mingled in the scenes which accompanied the achievement of our liberties, was personally acquainted with Washington and his co-patriots, and the signers of the Declaration of Independence, in our own country, and with Burke and Fox and their cotemporaries, in England, who was also familiar with the horrors of the French Revolution, and who is, perhaps, the only educated man of that age who survives to recount to us, of his own knowledge, the thrilling incidents and the great events of those times. The work is well written, is embellished with numerous sketches from the author's pencil, and is an interesting and instructive accession to our country's history.

5.—*Plain Sermons. By Contributors to the "Tracts for the Times."* In two volumes. New-York: J. & H. G. Langley. 1841. pp. 346, 350.

These volumes are a reprint of a London work, whose prefatory "Advertisement" is dated, "OXFORD, *The Feast of the Circumcision*, 1839." They are accompanied with a Note by Bishop Onderdonk of New-York, recommending them as "admirably adapted to the conveying of religious instruction on the sound principles of the gospel," and authorizing "the public reading of them" by lay-readers within his diocese. The writer of the Oxford "Advertisement" remarks that "the kind of characters which the writers of the 'Tracts for the Times' have wished to form" is best exemplified by such persons, as, "by habitual purity of heart and serenity of temper, give proof of their deep veneration for sacraments and sacramental ordinances;" and adds: "To carry out this design more fully, it has been thought well to publish, from time to time, in connection with the 'Tracts,' a few 'Plain Sermons,' in order to show that the subjects treated of in the 'Tracts' were not set forth as mere parts of ideal systems, or as themes for disputation," etc., "but are rather urged as truths of immediate and essential importance, bearing more or less directly on our every day behavior."

With this design we have in these volumes seventy-two short sermons. We have read a number of them, and have much less objection to the sermons themselves than to the design which is thus formally announced. Our readers are aware that we deprecate the peculiar though sometimes half concealed doctrines of the "Tracts for the Times," and their

tendency to substitute a veneration of external forms and observances for internal spiritual graces. It is, however, interesting to observe that their zeal in support of their peculiar views has not entirely choked the word, and rendered it wholly unfruitful even in the writers of the "Tracts." When they turn to the discussion of the ordinary topics of Christian duty and experience, they show that personal piety and serious religion may exist irrespective of the characteristic doctrines of the "Tracts;" and we cannot but suspect a concealed insincerity in the writers, when they profess to regard these independent discussions as belonging to the same system with the peculiarities referred to. To us most of these sermons appear to stand aloof from all connection with the Tracts, excepting that they are the productions of some of the same writers. They are mostly on the elementary topics of personal piety and individual Christian duties and privileges, such as *self-examination, religious peace, value of time, private prayer, God an impartial judge*, etc etc. Their personal appeals are urged in the language of faithfulness, and they are more direct and pungent, in this respect, than most modern English preaching which has fallen under our notice. They are written with great good taste and purity of style, and their principal deficiency, in comparison with the best sermons of our own preachers, is a lack of cogent argument, and of bold and discriminating views of the fundamental doctrines of the gospel. Some of the sermons, however, assert the apostolical succession of the English bishops, and say: "If this be denied us, we are nothing better than usurpers, self-appointed ministers," etc. From claims of this sort, other denominations are of course dissenters; and while we would cheerfully recommend most of these sermons as unexceptionable and in some respects excellent, the considerations above named stand in the way of our unqualified approbation.

6.—*An Introduction to the Greek Language; containing an outline of the Grammar, with appropriate Exercises for the use of Schools and private Learners. By Asahel C. Kendrick, Prof. of the Greek Language and Literature in the Hamilton Literary and Theological Institution. Utica: Bennett, Backus and Hawley. New-York: Dayton & Saxton. Boston: Gould, Kendall & Lincoln. Philadelphia: A. S. Barnes & Co. Rochester: Stanwood & Co. 1841. pp. 192.*

Prof. Kendrick has been for some time a successful teacher of Greek in the Hamilton Literary and Theological Institution of

this state. His experience in this employment has led him to feel the need of a book, which shall gradually unfold to his pupils and to others the peculiarities of this language, more especially as they have been developed by Thiersch, Buttman, Kühner and others. The plan of the work is to exhibit, clearly and succinctly, the principles of the grammar, in connection with numerous examples for the practice of the learner. These are to be successively mastered before the subsequent parts of the book are taken up. "If the author may be permitted to advert to his own experience as a teacher in Greek, he would express the conviction that the secret of success is to go slowly over the elements, and attend to only one thing at a time. To dwell on each topic until the pupil has perfectly mastered it, is the way to make his acquisitions profitable, and his subsequent progress easy, rapid and delightful." With an occasional exception, the plan of Prof. Kendrick has been judiciously executed; in some parts of his work he has been particularly happy. His aim is to make thorough scholars; and this Introduction, we doubt not, will contribute essentially to the fulfilment of this praiseworthy intention.

7.—*Elementary Geology.* By Edward Hitchcock, LL. D., Prof. of Chemistry and Natural History in Amherst College; Geologist to the State of Massachusetts, etc. etc. Second Edition. With an Introductory Notice, by John Pye Smith, D. D. New-York: Dayton & Saxton. Amherst: J. S. & C. Adams. 1841. pp. 346.

In our No. for Oct. 1840, we recommended this work as admirably adapted to the use of classes in colleges, and other seminaries of learning; and also as well suited to the general reader, who is destitute of the requisite facilities for studying the numerous and extended treatises on geology. We did not anticipate, however, that a *second* edition would be called for and issued within a single year. But such is the fact; and this of itself is gratifying evidence of its merit. It has secured the approbation, moreover, of those who are best qualified to judge of its worth,—among them Profs. Silliman of Yale College, Webster of Harvard University, Rogers of the University of Pennsylvania, Bailey of the Military Academy at West Point, Adams of Middlebury College. The Introductory Notice of Dr. J. Pye Smith is highly commendatory.

The author has endeavored to adapt this edition to the advancing state of geology. The most important addition relates to the subject of *Glaciers* and *Glacial Action*, which is now excit-

ing so much interest in Europe. Prof. Hitchcock has availed himself of the recent discoveries of Agassiz, Buckland and Lyell,—particularly of the *Etudes sur Glaciers* by Agassiz. About seventeen pages have been added to the present volume.

8.—*America, Historical, Statistic and Descriptive.* By J. S. Buckingham, Esq. In two volumes. New-York: Harper & Brothers. 1841. pp. 514, 516.

The above is the imprint on the titlepages of the two volumes before us. The lettering of the cover is *Buckingham's Travels in America*. Having read the work with some care, we rather prefer the latter as the more appropriate title. It contains, it is true, a great variety of "historical, statistic and descriptive" matter, and something, almost, *de omnibus rebus*. But the author has made *himself* and his performances the subject of quite too much of his narration; while his travels, the heralding of his name from place to place, and the popular plaudits which attended his lectures and public addresses form the only connecting links between his successive accounts of the cities, towns and states through which he passed, and of the scenes, manners, usages and institutions which he describes.

In reading a book of travels we are always pleased to find the narrative so conducted as to make us, as far as may be, the travelling companions of the author, seeing things in the order in which he saw them, and sympathizing with him in his vicissitudes. But when he becomes himself the hero of his own story, and magnifies every incident, and honors every person and institution just in proportion as they serve to give prominence to his own exploits, we are disgusted. Such we confess has been the effect, on our own mind, of this marked characteristic of the work before us. The author devotes a disproportionate space to these self-applauding descriptions, and is so much absorbed in them that he seems almost to have forgotten that there was any thing else great and good in the country, excepting those institutions and efforts, (and these were often the less prominent and influential,) in whose public proceedings he was himself invited to take part. The examples of this egotistic propensity are numerous and constantly recurring throughout the work. We give the following as specimens, Vol. I. pp. 187, etc. He says, "a very splendid entertainment, called a Temperance Festival," was "got up in honor of my arrival in Philadelphia," etc.—was "avowedly held to do honor to myself," etc.; and then quotes

from the newspaper accounts of it: "Mr. Buckingham addressed the audience in a strain of surpassing eloquence," etc.; "Mr. Buckingham, the celebrated lecturer, addressed the company," etc. "As a speaker, he possesses remarkable ease, fluency and readiness, combined with a graceful, unaffected manner," etc.; "Mr. Buckingham concluded his most eloquent, diversified, powerful and convincing address," etc., etc. Now however quotations like these, made by a writer in his own praise, may accord with the taste of British readers, to us they are intolerable. The wisdom of Solomon has enjoined it as a duty, and all the principles of correct taste, as well as of Christian humility, confirm the requisition: "Let another man praise thee, and not thine own mouth; a stranger, and not thine own lips."

There is another prominent characteristic of this work, which we feel constrained to name in terms of decided disapprobation and reproof. It is the inaccuracy of many of its statements, amounting in some instances, apparently, to an entire recklessness of the precise truth. And this is the more censurable, because the author claims to have enjoyed "special privileges" and advantages for acquiring "extensive and accurate information" on all the subjects of his work. He also boldly admits, that by thus commending his work to the confidence of his readers, in respect to the accuracy of its information, he has "increased the weight of" his "responsibility to public opinion for its execution." And yet in the face of these claims which are urged upon our attention, the work contains so many statements, which are palpably wrong or incomplete, that they destroy our confidence in the veracity of the whole, and we cannot appeal to it as an undoubted authority on any of the numerous subjects of which it treats. We regret the necessity of making these remarks, and we assure our readers they are the result of no unkind feelings towards Mr. Buckingham. He has ever appeared to us to be an amiable man, and our impressions are confirmed by the perusal of the present work. He is on the right side in respect to most of the great questions of morals, and of religious and political liberty. He is the friend of temperance, of missions, and of the universal diffusion of knowledge and religion. He is also a friend and an admirer of our free institutions. He writes concerning America without the appearance of any unfriendly feelings. He is as ready to praise as to censure; and we can attribute the inaccuracy of his accounts of men and things in this country to nothing worse than, perhaps, an excess of vanity, which leads him unduly to magnify every thing

with which he can associate his own name, and the long indulgence of a habit of speaking and writing without reflection.

But our readers will require of us some further evidence that our censure is well deserved. Take, then, the author's account of "the scale of remuneration to all classes of the legal profession" in New-York, which he says "is liberal without being absurdly extravagant or profuse. The younger members who have any practice at all as attorneys, readily make an income of 3,000 dollars, or from £600 to £700 a year, rising from this minimum to as much as 10,000 dollars, or about £2,000 sterling, a year. The smallest fee of a barrister of any standing, and in almost any cause, is 100 dollars, or about £20. The greatest fee to the most distinguished barrister in any regular cause tried in the city courts is 5,000 dollars, or about £1,000. But when a special cause of importance arises, requiring great skill and considerable application, especially if such cause has to be tried at a distance from the residence of the barrister, and he be a person of the first eminence, it is said, (and one of the profession was my informant,) that as large a sum as 25,000 dollars, or £5,000 have been paid; but this was admitted to be a very rare and unusual occurrence. The judges have fixed salaries, varying from 1,600 dollars for the youngest to 3,000 dollars to the oldest, including the Chancellor and the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court respectively." Who, before this, ever heard that the salaries of our judges were fixed on a scale varying with their respective ages? And who, that knows any thing of the pleasure with which our lawyers receive half the amounts above stated for their services, does not perceive that our author has given them at least two for one? And yet his statement is made in figures, with all the parade of accuracy, reducing dollars to pounds, as if it were a veritable account of the matter.

Again (Vol. I. page 139), in his account of the great effort lately made to increase and improve the Common Schools of New York, he names Mr. John Orville Taylor as having "taken the most active and practical part in this valuable labor," and, as an evidence of his qualifications for the task, he states that Mr. Taylor fills "a Professorship of the Science of Education in the New York University." But the name of that gentleman has never appeared on the catalogues of the University, and the public possess none of the ordinary evidences of his connection with it. Our author also tells us of "a monthly periodical" commenced by Mr. Taylor in 1836, "admirably conducted," etc., of which, he says "the circulation is immense, approaching to 50,000 monthly;" and adds (p.

142) : " For myself, I think the cheap little paper of the Common School Union of far more value and importance to the formation of the public mind and public morals of the rising generation of the United States, than all the other newspapers, magazines and reviews put together." It is a remarkable fact that the publication of the monthly paper here referred to (immense as Mr. Buckingham describes its circulation) was closed some two years since, as we suppose, for the want of support !

We have only space to add, that New-York politicians will be amused to read our author's grave account of the governor, lieutenant-governor, the comptroller and his deputy, the treasurer and his deputy, the attorney general, surveyor general, the secretary of state and his deputy, four canal commissioners and three bank commissioners, as constituting " what is called ' *The Regency*,' or effective force of the executive."—Vol. II. p. 20.

Such specimens of running and flying carelessness, of ludicrous misconception and reckless statements occur very frequently on the pages of this work, and render it almost worthless for the purposes of accurate information. It is, however, pleasantly written, and contains a vast variety of extempore remarks and discussions, and hastily formed conclusions, some of which are worthy of consideration. The author characterizes us as a newspaper-reading people, and he seems to have constructed his work to meet what he conceives to be the prevailing taste of the age both here and in England. But we apprehend he has even exceeded the demand in this respect, and given us a work so like what Carlyle calls the " straw-threshing" of the daily press, that, even by those who are contented with this kind of intellectual entertainment, it will scarcely be preferred ; its chapters having as little connection with each other as the successive numbers of a newspaper, and its subjects being as multifarious and incongruous as the topics of those ephemeral sheets, which even critics do not criticise.

A beautiful engraved likeness of the author appears as a frontispiece of the first volume, and the work contains numerous wood-cuts, illustrating American scenery, institutions, structures, etc. It is well " got up" by the publishers. It is dedicated by the author, in due form, to His Royal Highness, Prince Albert, who, it appears, approving of " the feelings of good will towards the American people, under which this work was undertaken," has promised it his " full sanction and patronage."

9.—*The Life and Times of Red-Jacket, or Sa-go-ye-wat-ha ; being the Sequel to the History of the Six Nations. By William L. Stone. New-York and London : Wiley & Putnam. 1841. pp. 484.*

Much praise is due to Col. Stone for his valuable contributions to the history of the aborigines of our country. Our own nation has no fabulous age to which it can trace the history of its origin. The beginning of our existence as a people was in the possession of a degree of light and knowledge, which the nations of the old world have attained only after the lapse of ages. But, to make room for the millions to which we, in the good providence of God, have been multiplied, we have displaced a people whose origin, to use the language of our author, "is lost in the shadowy obscurity of tradition for ages before the sound of the white woodman's axe rang upon the solemn stillness of the forest-continent," and who perhaps, by a different course of treatment by us, might have been raised to the civilization, the liberty, the law, and the religious consolations which we possess. From us, indeed, these blessings demand the highest expressions of gratitude and praise to the Giver of all good. With the enjoyment of these favors, however, we have the lingering consciousness of guilt; "the voice of" our "brother's blood crieth from the ground,"—from the beautiful fields which we cultivate; and if the judgments which it demands are delayed, it should at least remind us of the duty we owe to the remnant of that devoted race which still survives among us, or trembles along the borders of our advancing possessions. We should, therefore, be deeply concerned to know their history, especially during the progress of that desolation to which our own arms have reduced them, that we may the better understand and feel our obligations.

Such are the considerations which should commend to the grateful regard of our countrymen the labors of Col. Stone in the present work, which is the execution in part of his design to compile a complete history of the great "Iroquois Confederacy," with the addition of the Tuscaroras, constituting what is usually called the "Six Nations." An exceedingly interesting and somewhat extended portion of this history was given to the public, some three years since, by the same author, in connection with his "Life of Brant." After the death of Brant, Red-Jacket became the most distinguished man of the Six Nations. Our author has accordingly chosen to weave into the "Life and Times of Red-Jacket," the subsequent por-

tion of his proposed history, and promises, if life and health are spared, to take up the earlier periods of our Indian history in subsequent works. The present volume appears to have been compiled with great diligence, and contains a vast variety of interesting matter, and much that will be new to most readers. It is written in the lively and characteristic style of the author, and will be found no less entertaining than instructive. The title is preceded with an exquisitely beautiful engraved likeness of Red-Jacket, and the volume is executed in superior style by the publishers.

10.—*Philosophy of the Plan of Salvation. A Book for the Times. By an American Citizen.* New York: W. M. Dodd. 1841. pp. 240.

In some respects this is an extraordinary production. It is by "an American Citizen," and "published for the author." The edition is very small, and pecuniary profit does not enter into his plan. We are told in the Preface, moreover, that "with the exception of a few gentlemen, who kindly assisted in revising the sheets and reviewing the authorities and notes, it is not probable that any individual out of the writer's family will be able to conjecture, with the least degree of probability, who is the author."

We give the "occasion of the work" in his own language. "During some of the first years of the writer's active life he was a skeptic; he had a friend, who has since been well known as a lawyer and a legislator, who was also skeptical in his opinions. We were both conversant with the common evidences of Christianity; none of them convinced our minds of the divine origin of the Christian religion, although we both thought ourselves willing to be convinced by sufficient evidence. Circumstances, which need not be named, led the writer to examine the Bible. The result of the examination was a thorough conviction, in the author's mind, of the truth and divine authority of Christianity. He supposed at that time that in his inquiries he had adopted the only true method to settle the question in the minds of intelligent inquirers; subsequent reflection has confirmed this opinion." "The author commenced a series of letters to convey to his friend the evidence which satisfied his own mind beyond the possibility of doubt. The correspondence was, by the pressure of business engagements, interrupted. The investigation was continued, however, when leisure would permit, for a number of years.

The results of these investigations are contained in the following chapters."

The discussion is introduced by the following positions: "Man will worship;" "he will become assimilated to the character of the object that he worships;" "the character of heathen deities has always been defective and unholy;" "from this corrupting worship man has no power to extricate himself." Hence it follows that "a pure object of worship should be placed before the eye of the soul;" and the revelation of such an object "should be accompanied with sufficient power to influence men to forsake their former worship and to worship the holy object." The way is thus prepared for an examination of that system which purports to be a revelation from God. The author begins with the bondage of the Israelites in Egypt. The miracles wrought for their deliverance dethroned every false deity, and revealed the I AM—Jehovah. When they reached Sinai they were prepared to receive the Moral Law. The course of training to which they were subjected for ages gradually enabled them to comprehend spiritual truths, and, at the same time, effectually cured them of their propensity to idolatry. Passing to the Christian dispensation, the writer shows that Jesus Christ,—God manifest in the flesh,—is precisely the model, the teacher and the Saviour which we need. In the progress of this discussion, the reader will find many interesting thoughts, particularly in those chapters which consider the Levitical economy. The writer is evidently a scholar, and a reflecting, earnest inquirer after the truth, and his book is well suited to the wants of those who are still encompassed by the snares from which he has so happily escaped.

11.—*Letters from Abroad to Kindred at Home.* By the Author of "Hope Leslie," "Poor Rich Man and the Rich Poor Man," "Live and Let Live." In two volumes. New-York: Harper & Brothers. 1841. pp. 275, 297.

Every body reads the works of Miss Sedgwick. She writes to be read, by conveying useful instruction and information in an easy and entertaining style. The present volumes are the result of her late tour of a few months in Europe. They convey the impressions of things,—men, manners, scenery etc.—just as they were made on her own mind; and though the subjects of her sketches are familiar to most American

readers, she has succeeded better than most writers in making us almost feel that we have seen them with our own eyes. The freedom of her style, however, betrays her into the use of occasional expressions which might better have been spared. But it is in vain to attempt to criticise such a writer in so brief a notice as we can devote to these volumes. They are beautifully executed by the publishers.

- 12.—*Higher Arithmetic, designed for the use of High Schools, Academies and Colleges.* By Geo. R. Perkins, A. M., Principal and Professor of Mathematics, Utica Academy. Bennett, Backus & Hawley: Utica. Gould, Newman & Saxton: New-York. Gould, Kendall & Lincoln: Boston. A. S. Barnes & Co.: Philadelphia. H. Stanwood & Co.: Rochester. 1841. pp. 252.

This book is intended to supply a deficiency in the series of text-books, now used in the schools of this country. The author remarks, with justice, that "among the multiplicity of works which have appeared within a few years, there seems not to have been any material change; they all wear nearly the same aspect. Whilst other school books have been rapidly improving, our arithmetic has remained nearly stationary." This treatise is not designed to teach the elements of the science, but rather to assist those who have become familiar with its fundamental rules. We approve both the object and the execution of the work. Indeed we are not acquainted with any book in the language which is equal to it.

- 13.—*The Widow Directed to the Widow's God.* By John Angell James. With an Introduction. New-York: D. Appleton & Co. 1841. pp. 205.

Although our religious literature has many excellent treatises for *mourners*, it has none which are addressed specifically and solely to the *widow*. Mr. James conceives that "she needs a special message of comfort from the Lord, a voice which speaks to her case alone, a strain of consolation which, in its descriptions and condolence, is appropriate, and exclusively so, to her." No one could have been selected with ampler qualifications for this tender office. Aside from the native kindness and generosity of his heart, the providence of God has obliged him to prove the efficacy of the consolations which he extends to others.

- 14.—*Anecdotes, Religious, Moral and Entertaining ; alphabetically arranged, and interspersed with a variety of useful observations. Selected by the late Charles Buck. From the ninth London edition. New-York: Dayton & Saxton. 1841. pp. 514.*

This book is too well known to require any description or commendation. It has been out of print for some years in this country ; and hence the present publishers have stereotyped the work, and put it at a price which, they think, will facilitate its general circulation. It may be useful to all, particularly to ministers of the gospel.

- 15.—*The Prelatical Doctrine of Apostolical Succession Examined, and the Protestant Ministry Defended against the Assumptions of Popery and High-Churchism, in a Series of Lectures. By Thomas Smyth, Pastor of the Second Presbyterian Church, Charleston, S. C. Boston: Crocker & Brewster. New-York: Dayton & Saxton. Philadelphia: Hooker & Agnew, and Henry Perkins. Charleston: S. Hart, Sr. Cincinnati: Weed & Wilson. 1841. pp. 568.*

This well filled octavo volume has come into our hands so recently that we have had time to read only a portion of it. Our impressions, however, of its value, from a partial examination, are such as make us unwilling to delay the present notice ; with the hope that some correspondent will hereafter furnish for our pages a more searching review of the work than it is possible for us at present to give. Its leading subjects, as indicated in the titlepage, are of sufficient importance to demand a thorough discussion ; and we agree with our author in the belief that the time has come when such a discussion is necessary for the proper vindication of the rights and duties of the great body of the Protestant ministry and churches, against the assumptions of a portion of their own number who take common ground with Romanists in excluding from the pale of communion in the "holy, catholic and apostolic church," all who dissent from their doctrine of "exclusive apostolic succession." These assumptions are not only found in many of the old and standard divines of the Church of England, but have been of late zealously put forth in the Oxford "Tracts for the Times," have been avowed by English and American bishops and by a great number of the Episcopal clergy of both countries ; and the assurance with

which they are urged in many recent publications calls for a patient and thorough examination of the arguments advanced in their support.

Such is the work undertaken by our author; and the "subject matter" of the present volume, as we are informed in his Introduction, "is the prelatial doctrine of apostolical succession, or the exclusive claim of high churchmen and Romanists to be the ONLY true church of Jesus Christ, his ONLY true and valid ministers, and the ONLY sources of efficacious ordinances and covenanted salvation. This doctrine, and not episcopacy, is the subject of our animadversion. The principles involved in this assumption, and not the character or standing of the Protestant Episcopal church, we condemn." The topics of the twenty-one Lectures comprised in this volume are as follows: *Necessity and plan of the discussion, etc.—the tribunal by which the doctrine in question must be adjudicated,—tests by which it must be tried,—tested by Scripture,—by history,—by facts,—is essentially Popish in its tendencies and results,—is intolerant in its tendencies,—is unreasonable,—is contrary to the more approved and charitable judgment of the English and American churches,—is schismatical in its tendencies and results,—the Presbyterian church vindicated from the charge of schism,—the true doctrine of apostolical succession asserted.* These subjects are discussed with great earnestness and strength; and the ample and numerous authorities by which his statements and reasonings are confirmed show that the author has spared no labor, and dispensed with no available aid, in his investigations. As far as we have examined them, they appear to us thorough and satisfactory, and we cordially commend the work to the diligent study of our readers.

The same author has in preparation a second volume, which will complete his proposed discussion of PRELACY AND PRESBYTERY, in which he will take up the latter subject. We shall look with interest for its appearance.

16.—*An Ecclesiastical Catechism of the Presbyterian Church ; for the use of Families, Bible Classes and Private Members. By Thomas Smyth. 1841. pp. 124.*

This little volume is issued by the same publishers as the preceding work, by the same author. It is a well digested system of questions and answers on the church,—its government,—its officers,—its courts,—its power,—its fellowship, and the relation of the Presbyterian church to other denominations. It is a useful manual for Presbyterians, and may be instructive to others.

ADDITIONAL NOTICES.

We are obliged to condense our notices of the following works for want of room.

The Hannahs ; or Maternal Influence on Sons. By Robert Philip, Author of the Marys, Marthas, Lydias, etc., etc.
New-York : D. Appleton & Co. 1841. pp. 308.

The design of this work will be readily inferred from the subjects discussed. These are "the Peculiarities of Christianity toward Mothers," "a maternal Lamp," "Eve's maternal Character," "maternal Influence on Isaac,"—"on Jacob," "on Joseph," "on Moses," "on Samuel," "on David," "on Solomon," "on John the Baptist," "on the Saviour." As to the execution of this plan, it will suffice to say that it is in the usual style of this popular and prolific writer.

Memoir of Normand Smith ; or the Christian serving God in his Business. By Rev. Joel Hawes, D. D. Published by the American Tract Society. pp. 72.

This is a faithful and exceedingly instructive sketch of an eminent Christian. He was distinguished neither by his talents nor his station in life, but solely by his consistent, vigorous piety, and his extraordinary devotedness to his Master's service. Few have been so successful in carrying their religion into their daily business ; few have shown so uniformly that their plans and interests were identified with the Redeemer's kingdom. As the Tract Society now hold the right of publication, we hope they will give the work an extensive circulation.

The Doctrines of Christian Baptism, examined by the acknowledged Principles of Biblical Interpretation. In two parts, including both the Mode and the Subjects. By James J. Woolsey. Philadelphia : Printed by I. Ashmead. 1841. pp. 364.

The author of this volume is the pastor of the Baptist Church in Norwalk, Connecticut. Having preached a series of sermons to his people in advocacy of the views of his denomination, he was requested to give them to the public. This he has done in a form somewhat enlarged from the original discourses. He has evidently bestowed much thought and study upon the subjects here discussed, and he appears to be fully persuaded of the legitimacy of his conclusions. The argument is managed with considerable ability, although, as it seems to us, it is not conclusive.

A Spiritual Treasury for the Children of God; consisting of a Meditation for each Day in the Year, upon select Texts of Scripture. By William Mason. Selected from his Morning and Evening Meditations. Published by the American Tract Society. pp. 528.

These Meditations were written towards the close of the last century, with "the chief aim to exalt the Lord Jesus, the perfection of his atonement and righteousness, and the glory of his salvation." They are pervaded by an excellent spirit, and have been found exceedingly useful. The selections have been revised by the Tract Society, and published with some changes in obsolete or other defective forms of expression.

Practical Piety; or the Religion of the Heart on the Conduct of the Life. By Hannah More. Published by the American Tract Society. pp. 412.

The date appended to the Preface of this volume is March, 1841. Few books have been more popular or more useful. We have no doubt that the estimable writer is destined to exert a lasting influence upon the Christian world.

The Persecuted Family; a Narrative of the Sufferings of the Covenanters in the Reign of Charles II. By Robert Pollok, A. M., Author of the Course of Time, etc. New-York: Robert Carter. 1841. pp. 115.

Helen of the Glen; a Tale of the Scotch Covenanters. By Robert Pollok, Author of the Course of Time, etc. New-York: Robert Carter. 1841. pp. 113.

"The Persecuted Family" is a thrilling story of those times of cruelty and blood, which have loaded the memory of Charles II. and his minions with eternal disgrace. "Helen of the Glen" belongs to the same dark period; the tale itself however is less replete with the sufferings and the wrongs of the covenanters. Both are real incidents presented in the attractive style of the author.

A Discourse on the Moral Influence of Rail-Roads. By L. F. Dimmick, Pastor of the North Church, Newburyport, Mass. Newburyport: Charles Whipple. 1841. pp. 125.

The first half of this little volume is devoted to "the Perpetuity of the Sabbath." The author next considers "the ways

in which the Sabbath is violated ; this leads him to speak of Sabbath trains on rail-roads. Many weighty suggestions are made in connection with this last topic. We should like to see a copy of the book in the hands of every stockholder in Sabbath-breaking rail-road companies.

ARTICLE XI.

RECENT LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

Great Britain.

AMONG recent publications we notice Bellamy's New Translation of the Bible, Part VIII.—Proverbs, Ecclesiastes and Canticles ; Essays on the Christian Ministry, selected from the American Biblical Repository and other American Publications, with a Preface by Dr. Murch, Pres. of Stepney College ; D'Aubigné's History of the Reformation in the 16th Century, translated D. D. Scott, Part I. ; Ranke's History of the Popes, translated by Mrs. Austin, 2d edition ; Keith's Evidence of the Truth of the Christian Religion, 24th edition ; The Biblical Cabinet, Vol. XXXII.—Rosenmüller and others on the Messianic Psalms ; Dr. Prichard's Researches into the Physical History of Mankind, Vol. III,—containing the History and Ethnography of the Nations of Europe and Asia, to be completed in two volumes.

France.

Dr. Hodge's Commentary on Romans,—translated into French by Rev. Horace Monod of Marseilles, and accompanied by a Preface from the pen of Rev. Adolphus Monod, Professor in the Theological Seminary at Montauban,—is received with general favor by evangelical Christians. A very flattering notice of the work has been published in the Archives du Christianisme ; the writer, however, differs from the interpretation of Rom. V., denying the doctrine of imputation as set forth by Dr. Hodge, and affirming its opposition to the sentiments of the early Reformers, of Calvin in particular.—Stephens' Incidents of Travel in Central America, etc., has been translated into French.—A poem, entitled : *De Tristibus Franciæ*, by an unknown author of the 16th century, has recently appeared. The subject is the civil wars by which France was desolated under the three sons of Catharine de

Medicis. Among the recent announcements are *Panorama d'Egypte et de Nubie*; *Renovation philosophique ou Exposé des vrais principes de la philosophie*, by Girard de Candemberg; *L'Espagne artistique et monumentale*, Vol. I., a new publication by a Spanish Society of artists, intended to make known the monumental treasures of that country.

Germany.

In a recent letter to Dr. Robinson, Gesenius expresses his intention to complete his *Thesaurus* in 1842; he is also preparing a new edition of his *Commentary on Isaiah*.—A fifth edition of De Wette's *Introduction to the Old Test.* has appeared at Berlin, much improved and enlarged. We are informed that a font of movable hieroglyphic types has been cast at Leipsic; above 3000 of the characters are already completed.—Vol. V. of Neander's *History of the Christian Religion and Church* is published, extending from Gregory VII. to Boniface VIII.—Dr. J. Chr. Wm. Augusti died April 28th; he had been Prof. of Theology at Jena, Breslau and Bonn successively, and author of an *Introduction to the Old Test.*, *Manual of Christian Archeology*, and particularly of the *Memorabilia from Christian Archeology*.—Stephens' *Incidents of Travel in Central America*, etc., has been translated into German.

Italy.

The Chevalier Visconti has been appointed Professor of Archeology in the French Academy at Rome, in the place of the late Prof. Nibby.—From a recent account of the University of Padua, we learn that nearly all the professorships in the four faculties of Theology, Law, Medicine and Philosophy are filled. Dr. Valbusa is Prof. of Hebrew, the Exegesis of the Old Test., etc.; Dr. Agostini of Greek and the Exegesis of the New Test.; Dr. Fannio of Dogmatic Theology; Dr. Piotto of Ecclesiastical History. Intellectual and moral philosophy appears to receive but little attention.

United States.

Wiley & Putnam have Part I. of a *Complete Hebrew Concordance*, edited by Dr. Nordheimer and Wm. W. Turner, now in press. It is based on the Concordance of Fürst; the etymology and definitions of all the words will be given in English. The work will be published in 10 parts, and contain about 1200 pages, at \$1 a part.

INDEX TO VOLUME VI.

A.

Adams, Prof. Samuel, Psycho-Physiology in its connection with the Religious Emotions 323.

Additional notices 501.

America, Historical, Statistic and Descriptive, by Buckingham, noticed 491.

An American in Paris, on Religious Literature in France and Switzerland 76.

Anecdotes, Religious, by Buck, noticed 499.

Anglo-Saxon Literature 196. Influence of certain writers, causes of its neglect 197. New interest awakened 198. History of the Saxons 199. Their language 200. Printing 201. Ancient Saxon works 202. Anglo-Saxon Dictionary 207. Saxon Literature on the Continent 208.

Anthon, Prof. Charles, LL. D., Classical Dictionary, noticed 233.

Antediluvian Chronology of the Bible, by Michaelis 114. Editorial note 114. Question stated 115. Division of the subject 116. Hebrew reading preferred 117. Greek and Samaritan readings, absurd hypotheses 118. Greek translator of the Pentateuch 121. Comparison of versions 122. Testimony of Josephus 125. Ethiopic version 126. Discrepancies of tens and units 129. Sporadic varieties of reading 136.

Antiquities of the Christian Church, by Coleman, reviewed 212.

Arithmetic, Higher, by George R. Perkins, noticed 498.

B.

Baldwin, Rev. A. C., Themes for the Pulpit, noticed 245.

Baptism, Pres. Beecher on 28. Interpretation of Rom. 6: 3, 4 and

Col. 2: 12, 28. Points at issue and principles of reasoning 30. Position to be proved, sources of evidence 31. Objections answered 37. Argument from spiritual death, burial, etc. 37. Usus loquendi 40. Argument from the general system of truth 45; from tendencies and effects 48. Objections from authority 51. Apostolic practice 54. Final result 55.

Baptist Errors, Refutation of, by Rev. E. Hall, noticed 236.

Beecher, Pres. Edward, on Baptism, continued 28.

Being of God, A Posteriori Argument for the, by Prof. Hickock 350.

Biblical Researches in Palestine, by Dr. Robinson, noticed 230. Reviewed 419.

Buck, Charles, Religious Anecdotes, noticed 499.

Buckingham, J. S., Esq., America, noticed 491.

Bush, Prof. George, Notes on Exodus, noticed 484.

C.

Catechism, Ecclesiastical of the Presbyterian Church, by Rev. T. Smyth, noticed 500.

Central America, etc., Stephens' Travels in, noticed 237.

Chase, Prof. Stephen, Translation of Michaelis on Antediluvian Chronology 114.

Cheever, Rev. Geo. B., on the Philosophy of the Gnostics, etc. 253.

Christian Experience, by the Author of Christian Retirement, noticed 236.

Chronology of the Bible, Antediluvian 114.

Classical Dictionary, by Prof. Anthon, noticed 233.

Classics, Study of, as an Intellectual Discipline, by Prof. Sanborn 56.

- Ancient languages** 59. **Education**, preparatory 61. Influence of the acquisition of language on the memory 62; on mental discrimination 63; on attention and application 64; on the taste and imagination 66; on the reasoning powers 69. Objections to the classics 71.
- Clark's Sermons*, reviewed by Prof. Shepard 297. Life of the Author 298. Preparation for the ministry 299. Trials and changes 300. Social character 302. Religious character 303. Intellectual features 304. Subjects of his sermons 305. General arrangement 306. Divisions 307. Specimens 308. Resemblance to Pres. Edwards 309. Strength 311. Elegance, harmony and vivacity 312. Metaphor 313. Extravagance and harshness 315. High rank as a preacher 317. Results of his preaching 321.
- Coleman's Antiquities of the Christian Church*, reviewed by Prof. Emerson 212. Aspects of the Protestant world 212. France and Germany 214. Causes of increased attention to antiquities 215. Sectarian zeal 216. Infidelity 217. Such a book needed 218; commended 219; its importance 220. Specimens of the work 221.
- Common School System of New England, the*, by Rev. E. Davis 139. Origin of 139. Sources of support 140. Number of children in Massachusetts and Connecticut 141. School laws of other states 142. Private schools in Connecticut 144. Condition of schools in Massachusetts 145. Teacher's seminaries, monthly journal, etc. 146. American Institute, legislative action 147. Board of Education in Massachusetts and Connecticut 148. Normal Schools at Lexington and Barre 149. Opposition 150. Massachusetts School Library 151. Objections 152.
- Connecticut, Massachusetts and, Common School System in* 139. *Critical Notices*, 227, 482.
- D.**
- Davies, Rev. Samuel, A. M.*, Sermons, noticed 482.
- Davis, Rev. Emerson*, on the Common School System of New England 139.
- Disce Mori*, by Dr. Sutton, noticed 243.
- E.**
- Emerson, Rev. Ralph, D. D.*, review of Coleman's *Antiquities of the Christian Church* 212.
- Exodus, Notes on*, by Prof. Bush, noticed 484.
- F.**
- France and Switzerland, Religious Literature in*, by an American in Paris 76. The three great races 76. The French mind 77. Eminent Protestants 78; of the present time 80. Evangelical party 81. Anti-evangelical 82. Deceased divines 83.
- Free Agency*, Dr. Woods' reply to Inquirer 365. Influence of moral objects 365. Apostasy of holy beings 367. The law and the affections 369. Moral character of the affections 371; how to control them 373. Affections and moral objects 375. Sinful passions 377. Bodily appetites 379. Does the will control the affections? 381. Good and bad affections 383.
- G.**
- Gallaudet, Thomas H., & H. Hooker*, Spelling-Book, noticed 249.
- Gausson on Divine Inspiration*, reviewed, by an American in Paris 76. Plenary inspiration 87. *Converoria* 91; in what it consists 92. Objections to the doctrine 93. Views of the author 94. Further objections 99. Object of inspiration 100. Scriptures accord with facts and the laws of nature 101. Avowals of Paul 106. Use of sacred criticism in relation to inspiration 109. Summary of the doctrine of inspiration 110. Scripture proofs 112.
- Geology, Elementary*, by Prof. Hitchcock, noticed 490.

Gnostics, Philosophy of the, by Rev.

G. B. Cheever, the Manichean Heresy 253. Accounts by Eusebius 254. Beausobre 255. Birth of Manes 256. His profession 257. Tenets and discipline of the Manicheans 261. Two first principles 263. Transmigration of souls 265. Absurdities 267. Antiquity of the sources of Gnosticism 269. Oriental philosophy 275. Its mixture with Christianity 277. New Testament allusions to it 280. Causes of the spread and power of Gnosticism 282. Its influence on Christianity 287. Gnosticism in the Romish church 293.

God, A Posteriori Argument for the Being of 350. Nature of the argument 350. Methods of applying it 355. Argument from effect to final cause 356. Intuitive cognition of absolute truth 358. Extent of the argument 361. Steps of the process 362.

Grammar of the New Testament, by Prof. Stuart, noticed 483.

Grant, Asahel, M. D., on the Nestorians or Lost Tribes, noticed 227. Reviewed 454.

Great Cities, Moral Influences of, etc., by Rev. J. Todd, noticed 248.

Greek Language, Introduction to, by Prof. Kendrick, noticed 489.

H.

Hall, Rev. Charles, review of Robinson's Biblical Researches 419.

Hall, Rev. Edwin, Refutation of Baptist Errors, noticed 236.

Hallam, Henry, Introduction to the Literature of Europe, noticed 241.

Harvard University, Quincy's History of, reviewed 177, 384.

Hickock, Prof. L. P., A Posteriori argument for the being of God 350.

Hitchcock, Prof. Edward, LL. D., Elementary Geology, noticed 490.

Hooker, Horace, Gallaudet and, Spelling-Book, noticed 249.

Horticulture, the Theory of, by J. Lindley, noticed 249.

Hebrew Article, Correspondence on, Letter from Prof. Stuart 404. Reply of Dr. Nordheimer 412.

I.

Inquirer, Dr. Woods' reply to 365.

Inspiration, Gaussen on, reviewed 76.

Intellectual Discipline, Study of the Classics as an, by Prof. Sanborn 56.

J.

James, Rev. John Angell, Widow directed to the Widow's God, noticed 498.

Jay's Jubilee Memorial, noticed 250.

Jewish Literature 154.

K.

Kendrick, Prof. Asahel C., Introduction to the Greek Language, noticed 489.

L.

Lindley, John, on the Theory of Horticulture, noticed 249.

Lindsley, Rev. Philip, D. D., Primitive state of mankind 1.

Literary Intelligence 250, 503.

Literature, Anglo-Saxon 196.

Literature of Europe, Hallam's Introduction to the, noticed 241.

Livingston, Vanbrugh, Remarks on the Oxford Theology, noticed 247.

Lord's Supper, Sutton's Meditations on the, noticed 243.

Lost Tribes, the Nestorians or, by Dr. Grant, noticed 227. Reviewed 454.

M.

Massachusetts and Connecticut, Common School System in, by Rev. E. Davis 139.

Michaelis, J. D., Antediluvian Chronology 114.

N.

Nestorians, the, or the Lost Tribes, by Dr. Grant, noticed 227. Reviewed by Dr. Robinson 454. History of the Nestorians 454. Accounts of them by Smith and Dwight, and Perkins 456. Perkins' letter to Dr. Robinson on their language and literature 457. Dr. Robinson's reply 462. Prof. Ritter's account of the country, documents in the hands of Prof. Roediger 463. Accounts from Catholic missionaries 465. Trav-

els of Dr. Grant 466. His journal 467. His theory concerning the Lost Tribes 468; compared with previous theories 469. Argument from the names of Nestorians 470; from their rites and customs 471; first fruits, etc. 473; their physiognomy and proper names 476. Uncertainty of such testimony 478. Blood revenge 479. Parallels to the cities of refuge 481.

New England, Common School System of, by Rev. E. Davis 139.

Nordheimer, Prof. I. D. P., on the Rabbies and their Literature 154. Correspondence with Prof. Stuart on the Hebrew Article 404.

O.

Old Humphrey's Observations and Addresses, noticed 248.

Oxford Theology, Remarks on the, by Livingston, noticed 247.

P.

Parker, Rev. Joel, D. D., Lectures on Universalism, noticed 229.

Perkins, George R., Higher Arithmetic, noticed 498.

Phelps, Rev. A. A., on the Perpetuity of the Sabbath, noticed 242.

Philosophy of History, by Schlegel, noticed 245.

Philosophy of Salvation, by an American Citizen, noticed 496.

Plain Sermons, by Contributors to the Tracts for the Times, noticed 488.

Prelatical Doctrine of Apostolical Succession, by Rev. T. Smyth, noticed 500.

Primitive State of Mankind, Civilized and not savage 1. Proved by reason 2. History of savage tribes 4. Mexicans and Peruvians 5. Proof from history 6. golden age 8. Evidence from Revelation 11. Primitive cities 13. Merchandise 17. Arts 19.

Psychology, by Dr. Rauch, noticed 246.

Psycho-physiology in its connection with the Religious Emotions, by Prof. Adams 323. Effects of mental operations on the muscular system 325. Apparitions 327.

Relation of the will to the emotions 330. Effect of muscular action on the mind 333. Religious excitement 334. False principles in religious devotions 336. Great Revival in Kentucky 342. Wesley's account of the Methodists 344. Edwards' account of revivals in New England 345. Barclay's apology for the Quakers 346.

Q.

Quincy, Josiah, LL. D., *History of Harvard University*, reviewed 177. Claimed liberality of the founders 178. Mistakes concerning the founders of Yale College 179. What were their peculiar views? 182. Origin of the charter of Yale 184. Rules first adopted 187. Course of studies 189. Course of studies in Harvard 190. Opposition in Boston 191. Theological course 192. *Continued* 384. Charters of Harvard 384; of English universities 385; of Yale 386. Orthodoxy of the founders of Harvard 387. Their catholicism examined 389. Character of the first two presidents 392. Original seal 393. Agreement of the first clergy of Massachusetts 395. Attempts to procure funds for Yale 399. Hollis' donations 401.

R.

Rabbies and their Literature, by Dr. Nordheimer 154. Rabbinical schools in Persia 154; in Palestine 155, in Mesopotamia under the caliphs 157; in Spain 163. Compilation of the liturgy 163. Intellectual advancement of the Jews 170. Modes of interpretation 171. Jewish ritual 173.

Rauch, Rev. Frederick A., D. P., *Psychology*, noticed 246.

Red Jacket, Life and Times of, by Stone, noticed 495.

Religious Emotions, Psycho-physiology, in its connection with the, by Prof. Adams 323.

Religious Literature in France and Switzerland, by an American in Paris 76.

Review of Clark's Sermons 297.

" *Coleman's Christian Antiquities* 212.

" *Gaussen on Divine Inspiration* 87.

" *Grant's Nestorians* 454.

" *Quincy's History of Harvard University* 177, 384.

Robinson's Biblical Researches 419.

Robinson, Prof. Edward, D. D. Biblical Researches, noticed 230.

Reviewed 419. Importance of the subject 420. Want of previous materials 421. Causes of the want 422. Previous writers on the Holy Land 423. A second class of writers 425. Other writers 427. Dr. Robinson's preparation 429. Commencement of his tour, travels in the desert 430. Suez 432. Ancient remains between Suez and Sinai 433. Sinai 434. General view of the Arabian peninsula 436. Stations of the Israelites 438. Arrival at Jerusalem 439. Researches in and about Jerusalem 440. Remarkable discovery 441. Depressed condition of Jerusalem 442. Excursions 443. The Dead Sea, illustrations of Scripture 445. Return route 447. Roman road 448. Time spent in preparing the work 449. Results 450. Historical illustrations 451. *Review of Grant on the Nestorians*, etc. 454.

S.

Sabbath, Phelps' Argument for the Perpetuity of, noticed 242.

Sanborn, Prof. E. D., on the Study of the Classics 56.

Schlegel, Frederick von, Philosophy of History, noticed 245.

Shepard, Prof. George, review of Clark's Sermons 297.

Spelling Book, the Practical, by Galaudet and Hooker, noticed 249.

Smith, Rev. Eli, Dr. Robinson and,

Smyth, Rev. Thomas, Prelatical Doctrine of Apostolical Succession, noticed 499. Ecclesiastical Catechism of the Presbyterian Church, noticed 500.

Society, Taylor's Natural History of, noticed 244.

South Sea, Progress of the Christian Religion in the Islands of, noticed 235.

Stephens, John L., Incidents of Travel in Central America, etc. noticed 237.

Stone, William L., Life and Times of Red Jacket, noticed 495.

Stuart, Prof. M. Correspondence with Dr. Nordheimer on the Hebrew Article 404.

Sutton, Rev. Christopher, D. D., Lord's Supper, and Disce Mori, noticed 243.

T.

Taylor, W. Cooke, Esq. Natural History of Society, noticed 244.

Themes for the Pulpit, by Rev. A. C. Baldwin, noticed 245.

Todd, Rev. John, on the moral Influence, etc. of Great Cities, noticed 248.

Trumbull, John, Autobiography, noticed 486.

U.

Universalism, Parker's Lectures on, noticed 229.

W.

Widow directed to the Widow's God, by James, noticed 498.

Woods, Rev. Prof. Leonard, D. D., reply to Inquirer 365.

Y.

Yale College, one of the Professors of, review of Quincy's History of Harvard University 177, 384.

Journal of Travels, noticed 230. *Reviewed* 419.

~~82~~
110.515,

GEORGE A. PETERS,

**At the Office of the American Biblical Repository and the
American Eclectic, Brick Church Chapel, 36 Park Row,
Fronting the City Hall, New-York,**

**Will hereafter keep on hand a General Assortment of Books,
and will be happy to furnish orders from the country, for cash,
at the lowest market prices.**

Just Published and for sale as above,

WOODS' REPLY TO MAHAN

ON

PERFECTION.

**Viz. An Examination of the Doctrine of Perfection, as held
by Rev. Asa Mahan, President of the Oberlin Collegiate Insti-
tute, and others. By Rev. Leonard Woods, D. D., Andover,
Mass. Price $37\frac{1}{2}$ cents single, a liberal allowance to the trade.—
The above work will be furnished in Pamphlet-form at $18\frac{3}{4}$ cents
single, and at $12\frac{1}{2}$ cents per copy for any number more than
ten.**

Orders promptly attended to.

